

# AMERICA

## A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

VOL. L. No. 20  
WHOLE No. 1273

February 17, 1934

PRICE 10 CENTS  
\$4.00 A YEAR

### CONTENTS

<b>EDITORIALS</b> —Note and Comment.....	461-466
<b>TOPICS OF INTEREST:</b> Why Lent? by Francis P. LeBuffe, S.J. — A Young Man Speaks by John Bayer—Is Social Justice Good Business? by Basil C. Walker —A Certain Politician by George Carver.....	467-472
<b>POETRY:</b> Ash Wednesday.....	470
<b>ECONOMICS:</b> Has the Government Guaranteed Your Deposit? by Horace C. Whitman .....	472-474
<b>EDUCATION:</b> Teaching Religion by Daniel M. O'Connell, S.J.....	474-475
<b>WITH SCRIP AND STAFF</b> by The Pilgrim.....	475-476
<b>LITERATURE:</b> The Lights of Home by Catherine Rockwell Christopher.....	476-478
<b>BOOK REVIEWS</b> ...478-480... <b>COMMUNICATIONS</b> ...480-481.. <b>CHRONICLE</b> ...	482-484

### Atheistic School Influences

AS Pius IX observed, in a famous Letter to the Bishops of Ireland on the establishment of a Catholic University in that country, every teacher should be a model to his pupils through the moral integrity of his life. He ought to have "nothing more at heart than to fashion with all care the minds of young men to the practice of religion [and] to uprightness of conduct and all virtuous dealing." Catholics readily grasp the reason of this requirement. Since the teacher's task is not merely to awaken, develop, and discipline the minds of their children, but to train them to be good Christians he must himself be the living example of all that he teaches.

Even after the violent expulsion of religion from the schools of this country, much of this old Catholic tradition remained. It was taken for granted that the teacher, and even the college professor, should be at all times and under all circumstances an example of sobriety and circumspectness. If he could not openly teach religion and morality in the classroom, he was to teach at least by his example, and for years the schoolmaster hardly took second place to the parson as a public monument of godliness. Even today, in some of the remoter and less sophisticated towns and villages, a Puritanic standard, amusing when it is not exasperating, is demanded, and cases of dismissal for the crime of using cigarettes, or a hair bleach, are not unknown.

Far different, however, is the situation in the larger cities. As the school systems have grown, every year bringing a remarkable numerical advance, so too has increased the army of our teachers. For the vast majority of these men and women we have nothing but unfeigned respect. The most valuable and, financially, the least con-

sidered, of all public servants, they devote themselves zealously to a system which, as many among them realize, is unequal to the burdens placed upon it. Today the school is asked as a matter of course to undertake what a few brief generations ago was held to be the inalienable privilege and duty of the home. Many of the children in our great cities are but slightly acquainted with the usages and customs of civilized people, and all are to be developed mentally, and to be helped in the acquisition of those qualities which will fit them for a useful place in society. With a sinking heart, many of the teachers attack the problem, well aware that in its solution they must lack the invaluable assistance which can be afforded only by systematic training in religion, and by a moral code based upon religion.

The religious and moral development of the pupil depends in very large part upon the precept and example of the teacher. What, then, will be the effect upon the pupil in the public schools, when the teachers are the products of an education which denies the value of religion and of Christian morality? The objection is not met by saying that since the teacher is to concern himself merely with the various fields of secular knowledge, his opinions on religion are of no consequence. As Dr. William J. O'Shea wrote some weeks ago in his last report as superintendent of the public schools in New York:

Geography, history, civics, literature, and other subjects offer untold opportunities for deriding democratic doctrines, and for glorifying radicalism. A sneer, an intonation of voice, a gesture, a one-sided presentation will carry their meaning to the impressionable and observant children in the class.

This indictment is equally true of the teacher in whom respect for religion has been weakened or destroyed. What we affirm, and what we deny, in so vital a subject

as religion, is bound to shape our views and our outlook upon life.

Yet an inquisition into the religious views of the prospective teacher in the public schools is, in most of the States, forbidden by law. No religious test, direct or implicit, can legally be demanded as a condition of holding any public office in this country. The atheist, no less than the most religious Jew or Christian, is eligible to teach the children confided to the public school. In our larger cities, this problem presses for a solution. Yet under the legal restrictions placed upon the system in the States, how can it be solved?

As Pius XI teaches, in practice no school can be neutral. It is bound to be controlled by its fundamental principles, and to take its tone and spirit from its teachers. What will our public schools be in the day when a considerable proportion of the teachers are indifferent to religion, or hostile to it? That unhappy goal has already been reached in a majority of the non-Catholic colleges and universities. Dr. O'Shea is justified in his warning against teachers who in the primary schools deride "democratic doctrines" and "glorify radicalism." But if this Government is to endure, it is of far greater importance to be on our guard against the evil influences of an educational system which from the kindergarten to the university knows nothing of an Almighty Creator and of the ways of God with man.

### A Prohibition Obiter Dictum

THE Supreme Court ruled on a pretty point of law in its decision of February 5 which put an end to all prosecutions initiated prior to December 5, 1933, under the Prohibition statutes. In June, 1933, two men, Claude Chambers and Byrum Gibson, were indicted for possessing and transporting liquor. Chambers pleaded guilty, but sentence was deferred until his partner should be tried. On December 6, when Gibson's trial was called, Chambers filed a plea in abatement, and Gibson a demurrer to the indictment, each on the ground that the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment had deprived the court of jurisdiction. The court admitted the contention, now sustained by the Supreme Court. As a result, about 13,000 persons under indictment will never be tried.

The technicalities discussed by the Supreme Court are of interest only to the legal profession, but the layman will probably detect one or two phrases which seem to have been used with an eye on the Government's recovery program. "The Congress," said Chief Justice Hughes, in delivering the opinion of the court, "is powerless to expand or contract its constitutional authority." Prior to March 4, 1933, that statement would have attracted no attention. Today when Congress is delegating, improperly as some think, a share of its authority to the Executive, and assuming authority, as others claim, in matters reserved to the States, the Chief Justice's *obiter dictum* is vested with a deep significance.

In every conflict, whether economic or martial, the Constitution is subjected to strain. The decision of the

Supreme Court in the case of Milligan is but one of many examples which show disregard of the Constitution's plainest restrictions by military officers during the War between the States. The World War brought the Espionage Act and other regulations which the student of constitutional theory will endeavor in vain, whatever the courts may do, to reconcile with the First and Fifth Amendments. In peace time, one may assert with an easy air that Congress may neither expand nor contract its constitutional authority. When the cannons roar, or the bread lines form, theory is forgotten. Our children may yet read another parallel to the decision in the case of Milligan.

### Credit and the Government

THERE appears to be some doubt among bankers on the meaning of the speech addressed to them in New York last week by Chairman Jesse H. Jones, of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. In spite of his protests, did the Chairman mean that the Government was about to go into the business of extending credits? Of course, that is what the Government is doing now in various of its recovery activities—but are these activities to be made permanent?

Probably the bankers are so troubled with technical problems that the real intent of the speech escaped them. To the layman it seemed that Mr. Jones simply told the bankers that now they had the chance to help the country to get back to normal by assuming a liberal policy in extending credits, but that if they felt unable to adopt that policy, the Government itself would assume the function. "The President would be greatly disappointed if the banks did not perform *all* their functions," he said, and while the Government did not wish to dictate to them, "there can be but one alternative—Government lending."

That proposition is breathtaking. Yet when credit is unduly constricted, business lags and comes to an end, and when credit can be controlled by a small number of allied groups, it is only a question of time before these groups control the people and their Government. Speaking of this very condition Pius XI writes in his Labor Encyclical that those who "are able . . . to govern credit and determine its allotment," are also able to supply "so to speak, the life blood to the entire economic body," and to grasp "as it were in their hands, the very soul of production, so that no one dare breathe against their will." In order to consolidate this economic dictatorship, as the Pope styles it, the governors of credit strive "to acquire control of the State itself."

Here, surely, we have a condition against which the State must take severe measures. It does not follow, however, that the State should at once assume what would be equivalent to a monopolistic control of credit, but it does follow that this step may be taken should all measures of just control prove useless. In this sense, then, it may fairly be said that the control of credit is a function of government. To some degree, every modern Government exercises this control, but what Chairman Jones



seems to propose, as a reluctant alternative, is a permanent transfer of the normal function of a bank in granting credit to the Federal Government.

Obviously, without a liberal policy by the banks recovery will be indefinitely postponed. But it is also obvious that many banks feel that, on strict banking principles, conditions do not justify a larger liberality. Unless this problem can be solved, Government lending will soon become a necessity.

## The Prospect of War

**W**ARS and rumors of war continue to harass the nations. The Far East is a vast tinder box which at any moment may burst into flames. The boasts of braggarts, whether they sit in chancelleries, or gather at village street corners, may always be disregarded with safety, for they are sound and fury signifying nothing. But when, in the face of obvious hatreds and of conflicting national ambitions, the Elder Statesmen issue reassuring Notes, while pushing forward with frantic energy larger armaments, the field is set for war.

Nor is the state of Europe more encouraging to the hopes of millions who trusted that the World War was waged to end all wars. In view of Poland's intimate relations with France for the last sixteen years, the Polish "agreement" with Hitler is more like a sheaf of arrows than an olive branch, although its real significance cannot at the moment be stated with any degree of precision. But when studied in connection with Hitler's machinations in Austria, the conclusion naturally presents itself that the agreement registers another stage in Hitler's plans for the creation of a Pan-Germanic power. The end of February should show clearly a failure for Hitler in Austria, or a sweeping victory. Hitlerism in Austria would create a pretty problem for Mussolini, unless the Duce has in mind a policy which thus far has been kept hidden from the world at large. At present, it does not seem probable that the Italian leader would relish a neighbor whose blundering policies with regard to racial and religious issues form so startling a contrast with his own.

In spite of the protests of Governments everywhere, but especially in Europe, that they have nothing to conceal, it becomes increasingly difficult for the American to form even an approximately correct picture of the international scene. For our ignorance, censorship of the press is only partly to blame since even without censorship State papers confuse as much as they enlighten. The riots in Paris, now fairly under control as these lines are written, may be nothing more serious than a protest against a Ministry popularly judged to be certainly incompetent and, in some departments, probably dishonest. Yet it may also be an ominous symptom of radical distrust of the Government's fundamental purposes. To learn that Royalist leaders have been active not only in the provinces but in the capital itself, is to be made aware that forces which for at least two generations have not been taken seriously by the Government,

or by a majority of the French people, must now be reckoned with.

What will be the outcome of these plots and counter-plots? Some students of international relations assert that war, if it does not come in the early months of 1934, cannot be deferred for much longer than another year. If war is to be the world's lot, it will be a war such as a stricken world has never known, a war in which Governments will employ engines of destruction in comparison with which the armaments of 1914-1918 will seem as toys, a war in which, more emphatically than before, no nation will be the victor, but all will be losers. To reflect on the unhappy fact that nations can find no other means of settling their differences than to kill and to destroy, makes one wonder how much the world has learned after all these centuries of civilization. Yet the state in which the nations now find themselves is the inevitable result of the violent separation of religion and morality from government which, four centuries ago, was hailed as a beneficent revelation. That separation has borne bitter fruit, and we can look for nothing better until all Governments recognize that they, no less than the humblest citizen, are bound by the laws of Him in Whose name alone they rightly exercise sovereignty.

But God still reigns, and in His hands are poised the nations. It rests upon all who hate war and love justice to unite in work and in prayer, begging the Father of all to turn the minds of the Governments of the world to thoughts of peace and righteousness. He alone can save us, and when we approach Him with humble and contrite hearts, He will give us peace in this our day.

## The Company Union

**I**N itself the company union is neither illegal nor unjust. If the workers freely choose this form of union, or eschew all unions, they do nothing which *per se* is wrong. But that does not end the case. Company unions which have given satisfaction are few. As a rule, the company union's first, if not exclusive, purpose is the welfare of the employer at all costs, and, practically speaking, it is impossible to rate it as an association for the promotion and defense of the worker's rights in industry. Hence when there is question of joining a free union affiliated or not with the American Federation of Labor, or a company union, the employee should also take into consideration the welfare of labor at large and of the community. His own immediate gain should not be the sole or dominating motive of his choice.

Six months ago, it was commonly thought that the famous section 7A was a death blow to the company union. That seemed to be its obvious meaning, and it was the meaning accepted by the public at large. But what are the rights of the minority when the majority of employes in a given shop decide to form their own union? May this minority also exercise the right of collective bargaining? In case the majority adopts one policy, and the minority a policy directly at variance, what is to be done?

The American Federation of Labor claims that the effect of section 7A should be to quash the minority, whenever an agreement cannot be reached. Reports from Washington state that Administrator Johnson is reluctant—as are certain rebellious employers—to adopt this view. Labor intends to ask legislation defining what is meant by “collective bargaining” and by “employee representation.” Questions turning on conflicts of rights are proverbially difficult, and it is to be hoped that labor will have its representatives in the Congressional committees, as well as capital to whom every free union is anathema.

### Note and Comment

#### Archbishop Redwood's Jubilee

**I**N our days of restless change, an extraordinary grace, like the grace of final perseverance, seems to attach to the person or place that fulfils the ambition of the saintly Curé of Ars, of forever sticking at it. Shrewsbury School, founded by King Edward VI in 1552, boasts having had only three headmasters in a space of 110 years: Butler, Kennedy, and Moss; and all three were brilliantly successful. Says the N. C. W. C. News Service, only once in the course of a century has a Bishop of Arras had to appoint a parish priest at Teneur, in that diocese. “The present pastor was appointed in 1890 and his parishioners hope that he will be with them for many years to come.” His predecessor was appointed parish priest of Teneur in 1833 and remained there until his death in 1890, having held office for fifty-seven years. Dean and crown of all the long-termers, however, is the venerable Archbishop of Wellington, N. Z., whose jubilee will be celebrated on February 24-28 coming. Archbishop Redwood is now ninety-four years of age; and was consecrated as Ordinary of Wellington on March 17, 1874. Today he is the oldest Bishop of the entire Catholic Church, both in actual age, as well as in term of office: oldest in years, but still young in mind and heart. *Ad multos annos!*

#### Catholic and Roman Catholic

**T**HE point raised by the Most Rev. John T. McNally, Bishop of Hamilton, Ont., in his petition to the Legislature of Ontario, is one that frequently has occurred to American Catholics. The bishop asked that the word *Roman* be deleted from the official title of the diocese as a corporation; and be called simply “Catholic Diocese of Hamilton,” instead of “Roman Catholic Diocese of Hamilton.” The Bishop has ample right on his side, since the Catholic Church, and all that belong to the Church Universal, is not “Roman” in the delimiting or restrictive sense in which the term is used by Anglo-Catholics. The title “Catholic” is universally understood as referring to that Church whose visible Head resides in Rome; and to none other, despite strenuous efforts to change the

popular mentality. However, Bishop McNally's petition met, as was to be expected, with vigorous opposition from Anglicans and Presbyterians as well. The clergy and laity of the Anglicans' Niagara Diocese adopted a resolution opposing the requested change, and the Anglican Bishop forwarded a protest to Premier Henry, the Attorney General, and local members of the Ontario legislature. The change was regarded as a “concession” to Rome, and a stigma on all who did not recognize Rome's claims. While regretting this turn of events, and completely disallowing the Anglican objections, one is still faced by the fact that it is difficult to change such a nomenclature once it has become sanctioned by long usage. It is for that reason that Americans, particularly in those places and circumstances where the usage of “Roman Catholic” has not become ingrained, should strive vigorously to keep the appellation “Catholic” free from the term “Roman” in official practice. Dealings with school boards, charity and welfare organizations, Government services, fund-raising campaigns, and other interdenominational activities offer abundant occasion for such watchfulness. If this is exerted, it will not be necessary to circulate petitions when it has become difficult to change.

#### Catholics At Montevideo

**T**HAT an eminent Catholic layman of Argentina, Dr. Cafferata, speaking at the seventh Pan-American conference in Montevideo in January, declared that the Argentine delegation favored woman suffrage, may not be strikingly significant. Catholics since the days of Mistress Margaret Brent, of colonial Maryland fame, have advocated various phases of women's civil rights. But Dr. Cafferata's utterances have a special meaning now that Catholic Spain is reaping the benefit of permitting her women to vote in the elections that placed Gil Roblés in the position of vantage, and started that country upward on the long path of political reconstruction. They also remind us, as is pointed out by the correspondence of the N. C. W. C., that Catholics took an important part in the Uruguay events.

President Gabriel Terra, of Uruguay, although not a Catholic, is highly respected by the Catholic Church and is the head of an entirely Catholic family, Señora Terra and all their children being devout adherents of the Catholic Faith. The president of the conference, Dr. Alberto Mañé, Secretary of State for Uruguay, is a good Catholic and his family equally devout.

Among the Uruguay delegates, the secretaries of the various commissions, and the foreign delegates, were many outstanding Catholics. Dr. Castro, of El Salvador, a Catholic, hailed the Chaco truce as a triumph of Christ the Saviour. The words of our own Secretary Hull, appealing for spiritual, as against merely material prosperity, found a warm echo in Catholic hearts.

#### Liturgy—But No Mass

**I**T is interesting to find the Liturgical Movement—or at least an imitation of it—getting into the non-Catholic churches. Several weeks ago in Washington, Bishop



Perry, presiding bishop of the Episcopal Church, launched a movement to be called "the church-wide endeavor." It will consist in a wider and more understanding usage of the Book of Common Prayer. He urged his communicants to draw their rule of life from the Book and to use its services of morning and evening prayer with their appointed Psalms and Lessons as a help for private devotions and as a preparation for both public worship and frequent communion. To Catholics all this looks like an effort to get in step with the Liturgical Movement and its insistence upon the Mass, frequent Communion, the Missal, and the Psalter. Meanwhile in Brooklyn, Dr. H. E. Mather, pastor of Christ Church (which draws its members from various denominations), has suddenly gone primitive Christian and has instituted a new kind of worship in his church. Services there will henceforth consist of three parts: There will be a period of instruction, followed by a period for hymns and prayers, and then a celebration of the eucharist. These three divisions, the learned doctor told the press, parallel the method of worship in Apostolic times. The first two periods correspond to the ancient Christian Service of the Catechumens; the third period is like the "Missa Fidelium," or Service of the Faithful. All this is most interesting. But Catholics can hardly fail to note the unfortunate little slip by which the Brooklyn pastor has mistranslated the word *Missa* as *Service*. Until Dr. Mather has an altar and a Sacrifice, his "Missa Fidelium" will remain but a dim shadow of the Apostolic Mass.

#### Immunity for Lynchers

TO Maryland and California must now be added Missouri to make up at least three States in which lynchers can claim immunity from punishment. Missouri's attempts to punish the lynchers of Lloyd Warner, a Negro youth lynched on November 28, 1933, were checked when the jury refused to convict on the State's first and strongest case, and came to nothing when the Attorney General of the State announced that because of this acquittal, the trials pending against seven other men would be dropped. It is only fair to say, however, that the officials tried to do their duty, but were powerless against a jury which apparently condones lynching. Not only was the man acquitted by this jury identified by a number of witnesses, but it was proved that he had boasted about his participation in Warner's lynching. Legal breakdowns of this kind make observers ask whether the power of self-government, once thought to be an American characteristic, has been completely lost. They also bring the day of Federal interference and, possibly, of Federal bungling, appreciably nearer.

#### The Roving Taxicab

THE strike of the taxicab drivers in New York is an illustration in miniature of the rudderless condition of industry in this country. When the strike began, there were more than 66,000 licensed drivers in the

city, and about half that number of cabs, of which only some 15,000 were in active service. In 1930, the gross take of these cabs was nearly \$150,000,000 annually, and while the individual net is probably smaller today, the gross is estimated to be considerably larger. As a matter of fact, so many cabs have been licensed that the owners, it is said, have been barely "breaking even," while the plight of the drivers is even worse, since long hours of hard service do not bring them a living wage. The whole field is overexpanded and badly organized. Companies compete against one another, and the drivers have no real union to represent their interests and defend them. For years the city has been regarded as a vast field for exploitation, and the result is that neither the drivers, the owners, nor the public have been satisfied. From time to time, efforts have been made to organize the business on a sound economic basis, with the city governing it like any other public means of transit, but in every instance grasping owners, employees badly advised, or politicians with an eye for loot, have been able to block a much-needed reform. Whether the strike of 1934 will effect what should have been done years ago to regulate and control this industry remains to be seen. The net results up to the present seem to be loss of money by the drivers and owners, and considerable inconvenience to the public. Happily, the strike was not marked by notable violence.

#### Our Besieged Hotels

IF on your next visit to New York, you find your favorite hotel besieged by sandwich men who display placards asking you not to enter, do not be surprised. A strike is in progress and, at the moment, it seems to be growing. The issues are somewhat muddled, but enough is known to justify the conclusion that many of these striking hotel employees have been treated with considerably less consideration than you would give, not to your favorite pup, but to a bench-legged cur barely tolerated on your premises. Unfortunately, it is also clear that the strikers are largely controlled by men who do not appear to realize that the first thing which a strike leader must do is to win popular approval. As a result, the average New Yorker remarks: "The strikers are just a bunch of Reds who oughta be shot," and there his interest lapses.

---

### AMERICA A-CATHOLIC-REVIEW-OF-THE-WEEK

---

WILFRID PARSONS Editor-in-Chief	JOHN LA FARGE
PAUL L. BLAKELY GERALD B. DONNELLY	DANIEL BASSETT
FRANCIS X. TALBOT FLORENCE D. SULLIVAN Associate Editors	
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager	

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID  
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00  
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:  
Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.  
Telephone: MEdallion 3-3682  
Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.  
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW  
Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

## Why Lent?

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S.J.

**P**ENANCE and mortification, self-denial and self-repression have never been much in fashion in this world. Possibly, they are less in fashion today than ever before in the Christian era. For these are the days of "self-expression," of the excommunication of "repression," of the banning of the psychology of "don'ts," and so on. Lent is a direct slap in the face of a "self-expressing" world.

Then, why Lent? More than ever must Catholics have an answer ready. A threefold answer may be given, based on the general laws of rational and Christian mortification, applied to this particular season of the ecclesiastical year.

The first and psychologically fundamental reason for self-denial is the securing of self-control. This is a deliverance of reason itself, based on experience. No one can become master of himself unless he schools himself to say "no" to his desires and inclinations precisely at the times and in the circumstances wherein he might have said "yes." To go in the way of pleasures always to the very threshold of what is unlawful means that under the stress of strong temptation one will easily transgress the limits reason counsels and God enjoins. One needs to store up a reserve energy, upon which one can call when there is need. One must have trained oneself to halt summarily at the word of command, even when not needed; just as in schools we have fire drills when there is no fire about at all.

Pleasures are right and lawful, for God made this a pleasant world, and He made it a pleasant world *for man*. It is a striking thing to read the first chapter of Genesis in the light of the "pleasantness" of the world. Throughout the days of creation, we read: "And God saw that it was good." And when all things, man himself included, had been created, the story is closed off with the words: "And God saw all the things that he had made and they were very good."

Thus the world as God made it is good. But man has done much to spoil this world and the world which man has made against God's will is bad. God has made the human eye to see the beauties of His creation; man has made the unholy play and motion picture, and has printed the sex-drenched novel. God has given the taste for food and drink; man has exalted gluttony and drunkenness into almost social virtues. God has given the ability to dance; man has invented the lascivious dances. God's good world—man's bad world. God's world we may enjoy lawfully—and yet even there we shall overstep, unless we have learned to deny ourselves at least in little things. Man's sinful world cannot be enjoyed without taint, and yet this world of man's making is a tempting thing and makes strongest appeal at times to that which is lowest within us yet is hardest to control when once aroused.

Successful resistance to its appeal can come only from repeated self-denial where wholly lawful things are concerned.

Francis Thompson puts this law succinctly in "Any Saint":

Compost of Heaven and mire,  
Slow foot and swift desire!  
Lo,  
To have Yes, choose No;  
Gird, and thou shalt unbind;  
Seek not, and thou shalt find;  
To eat,  
Deny thy meat.

Thus, psychologically, self-denial is the price of self-control. In fact, it is the price of real adulthood. Without self-denial, I shall always do what I *want* to do, and when I *want* to do it—and that is what a child does. With self-denial, I shall learn to do what I *ought* to do and when I *ought* to do it—and that is to be a grown-up.

A second valid reason for self-denial (which then turns it into penance) is reparation for past sins. If I have misused the powers that God has given me, then I should repair that wrongdoing by cheating myself precisely of those things the misuse of which meant sin. If excess in drink has found place in my life, then penance may rightly take the form of denying myself the pleasures of taste. If my eyes have sinned in looking upon wanton things, then those same eyes may properly be denied some thing of beauty they might legitimately enjoy.

That punishment "in kind" is proper psychologically. It is also proper morally. For if I have allowed myself to vindicate a supremacy over my eyes that ran counter to God's supremacy, then it is very right to show unrequited submission by not using them when I might do so lawfully. If I have sought my ease and comfort and thus neglected the duties of my state of life, a bit of self-inflicted discomfort is quite in order to prove my willingness to retrieve my mistakes.

These two motives are founded quite solidly on reason itself. For them I require no revelation from God, nor do I need to know aught of Christ. But the third reason for self-denial and penance is a purely Christian reason: likeness with Our Lord, and imitation of His life and suffering. It is precisely this reason which is operative in the decision of the Church to have her children abstain from meat on Fridays, and to fast and abstain during Lent. Friday is the weekly reminder of Christ's passion; and so Catholics vitalize that memory by adjusting their lives thereto that day, with a definite form of self-denial—abstinence from flesh meat. Lent is the yearly reminder of Our Lord's own fast of forty days, and particularly of His passion and death for us; and so the Church would have us go decidedly out of our way to bring into our own lives strong pledges of our imitation of our crucified King.



He was poor and deprived of life's luxuries; during Lent we should deprive ourselves voluntarily of at least some of the things that go to make life comfortable. He was hungry at times and had not food to eat; the fast, morning and evening, will make us one with Him in such privation. He often prayed the night through on the mountain top; a greater amount of prayer will unite our hearts more closely to His. He was scourged, and crowned with thorns, and crucified; a bit of positive pain or discomfiture inflicted willingly on ourselves, will prove us no "delicate soldiers of a thorn-crowned King." Our Lord said Himself: "He that taketh not up his cross and followeth me, is not worthy of me."

There is no morbidity in all this. It all springs from love: the love that wants to make reparation; the love that wants to grow more like the One loved. No one in his right mind takes pleasure in inflicting pain on himself or in denying himself some tidbit or recreation. (That there have been some thus morbidly minded is no least reason for charging the whole system of Christian and rational mortification with abnormality.) Love is really the capacity for sacrifice, and the more one loves, the more is one ready to give up all for the beloved, and the more does one give up in fact.

It is all done out of love: to show our own love, and to beg more manifestation of God's love to us. This is brought out clearly in the liturgy.

At the Blessing of the Ashes on Ash Wednesday in the third Collect we read:

O God, who art moved by humiliation, and appeased by satisfaction; incline the ear of Thy clemency to our prayers, and mercifully pour forth upon the heads of Thy servants, sprinkled with these ashes, the grace of Thy blessing; that Thou mayest both fill them with the spirit of compunction, and effectually grant those things which they have justly prayed for; and ordain that what Thou hast granted may be established and remain unmoved for ever.

Throughout the liturgy there is the message of hope. Though, while she marks our heads with ashes, Mother Church reminds us: "Remember, man, that thou art dust, and unto dust thou shalt return," she has first cried out, borrowing the word from the Psalmist (lxviii, 17): "Have mercy, O Lord, for thy mercy is kind; look upon us, O Lord, according to the multitude of thy tender mercies." While the ashes are being distributed the choir chants:

Let us change our garments for ashes and sackcloth: let us fast and lament before the Lord, for our God is plenteous in mercy to forgive our sins.

Between the porch and the altar, the priests, the Lord's ministers, shall weep, and shall say: Spare, O Lord, spare thy people: and shut not the mouths of them that sing to thee, O Lord.

We have sinned—yes. And we deserve punishment—yes. But God is a loving Father and His mercy is above all His work, as we read in the Introit of the Mass:

Thou hast mercy upon all, O Lord, and hatest none of the things which thou hast made, dissembling the sins of men for the sake of repentance, and sparing them; for thou art the Lord our God. Have mercy on me, O God, have mercy on me; for my soul trusteth in thee.

"Dissembling" (*dissimulans*), "making out as though they were not" is a strong word and yet a hopeful word. It needs, indeed, the warning of St. Paul (Rom. vi, 1): "What shall we say then? Shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? God forbid." No, not an enticement to sin, but an encouragement to repentance. For we can realize our sins in one of two ways: as Judas did, or as Peter. Judas' realization was without hope—and he hanged himself; Peter's hope drove him, despite his sin, to the feet of Christ. And so though our sins be as scarlet, or as many as the sands of the sea, the prayer of the Tract of the Mass is ever rightfully and hopefully on our lips: "O Lord, remember not our former iniquities; let thy mercies speedily prevent us—for we have become exceeding poor."

## A Young Man Speaks

JOHN BAYER

I AM twenty-one. For five long years, ever since I have been able to understand them, I have listened, at first with shame and a feeling of remorse, now, at last, with defiance and anger, to the choruses of anathemas and censures that have fallen during that time upon the younger generation. We are the reckless youth—the petters, the drinkers, the run-about-towns, the immoral, the irresponsible, the uncultivated, the lazy—but why go on? Facts being what they are, I cannot deny, for the large part of us, at least, the charge.

You call us drinkers, you of thirty or more. None of my age could, by the Constitution, have sat in our Legislature and permitted Prohibition to exist in our country. You make drink an evil. You cover it with the romantic guilt of a criminal offense that does not appeal to our conscience as criminal, and thus enhance it in our eye. You make open drinking a sin. We do not think it evil to do what we feel is not a sin. Defiance is the nature of youth, and in this you give us a perfect right for defiance. The youth of England, Spain, Italy, France, is not a youth of drinkers. You yourselves, as you truly say, were not like us. But you experimented with us, and with our souls, and after a trial in which, being what we are, we could not win, you toss us aside as sots and good-for naughts.

You call us immoral. Few of us of twenty-one sit in the control of the organizations that furnish the amusement of this country, amusement that panders to sensuality. It is not we who have chosen to have raised, for emulation, on silver screens and ornate stages, harlots and gangsters. You charge us with immorality. That may be, but the tricks and the trade of immorality have been learned at your workshops. You mock marriage before our eyes, drunkenness becomes indifferent, morality is prudishness, and the lack of it is virtue. We demand this, you say. The baby would play with fire, but for the mother who, having experienced the danger of fire, prevents such action. You have passed through those years in which we of twenty-one find ourselves. You know

the sensuality, the curiosity, that is strong in us, and you must know how it can be restrained or inflamed accordingly as we are watched and cared for.

It is you, too, who for the greater part write, edit, and print our novels, newspapers, and magazines. What crimes you have committed against us on this account! Review the literature of the day, pick up a magazine, or read the ten best stories of the year. Of old only the brave, the strong, and the pure were described as heroes, and rightly so. It is characteristic of books and stories that they arouse emulation of their characters, especially in the young. And, what do you place before us? The weak, the impure, the impious, the unscrupulous, the proud, the gangster. As is natural, we tend to emulate them and in some way transfer their actions into our own lives. Do you blame us for it?

Not all of you of thirty or more write these stories or produce these pictures, but, to your shame, you allow us to see and read them. You sit idly by, you allow magazines, perhaps not too dangerous for yourselves, to fall into our hands. You permit indiscriminate audiences to sit at plays and pictures that even you sometimes blush at. Fifty cents will take the innocence of thirteen, fourteen, and fifteen into the theater as readily as it will take the sophistication of thirty or forty. The most lurid magazines are evaluated, not at the harm they may do the soul, but at the price marked on the cover. The circulating libraries are for all, young and old. Where are your voices of protest?

You call us irresponsible and God-less. You have taken away our God. It is you who sit in university chairs and, with cynical smiles, knock the props from under our concept of God, and then cry out when we follow this

destruction to its logical conclusion. If there be no God, there is no responsibility. Preach your modernism, your humanitarianism. We call it rot. Gaze upon the suffering, see the deceit of man, the wickedness and guile of this world of ours. If there is no God to whom we must render an account, why should we suffer? Why not be the biggest deceivers? Why not be wicked and full of guile, if it will make us enjoy this world more? God-less! We do not want to be that. God is such a help to the young. But if God is not to us what He should be, what must you be in His eyes, who long ago said, "Woe to that man who scandalizes one of these my little ones. It were better for him were he cast into the sea with a millstone around his neck." You cannot deny the scandal. Even if you do not write our novels, produce our plays, or directly make our laws, you sit idly by, with a blind and apathetic quietude, which you only break to condemn and censure us.

I have not intended this to be a work of literature, of argument, or of philosophy. It is only my heart that speaks. Perhaps I do not know the enormity of the task I ask you to undertake. But I do know that we of twenty-one are not altogether corrupt. There are noble aspirations in our souls; we long for light and truth and above all for peace. This is the reason I have written. You of thirty or more have passed through the age of twenty-one. Have you forgotten its dangers, its susceptibility to good or to evil, its longings and its aspirations? Are you going to allow us only the dirty side of life?

We place the challenge before you, and, in the name of God, of virtue, and of happiness, we beg you to accept it in order to vindicate yourselves, rescue us, and restore to us our faith in the goodness of our fellowmen.

## Is Social Justice Good Business?

BASIL C. WALKER

**S**Ocial Justice, as expressed in the New Deal, is not an abstract hope. It is the most intensely practical thing in the world today. *It is good business.*

This thought emerges with compelling force from a consideration of all the elements of the Administration's economic program, both domestic and foreign, as parts of one complete plan. It is only by looking at them in this way that we can really discuss any one of the parts with real understanding. When we do regard them in this perspective, we break through a vast maze of befuddling detail, and see the inner meaning and the practical value of what is being done.

Moreover, we see clearly the striking similarity between the Administration's program and the principles laid down in "Rerum Novarum" and "Quadragesimo Anno" by Pope Leo XIII, and by our present Holy Father, Pope Pius XI.

While few men are disposed to question the ethical desirability of social justice in our daily lives, it is very probable that many do entertain grave doubts as to its

practical value. For this reason, it seems both timely and helpful to submit evidence that social justice *is* practical. Furthermore, it is my purpose to submit evidence which comes from the fields of business and finance themselves, rather than from moral philosophy alone.

In order to get our case into correct focus, it is important to understand that we are dealing with more than a mere cyclical business revival. It seems reasonably clear that we are actually in the initial stages of a renaissance in the economic field.

A renaissance manifests itself through various human activities, but such activities are merely outward evidences of an inner motivating spirit. This spirit is the essential characteristic of a true renaissance. Such a spirit is abroad in the world today. There is, both in this and in other countries, a questioning of old practices—practices sanctioned by usage and even by law. It is being insistently demanded as to such practices: Are they equitable? Are they right?

It is easy to argue that such questioning is merely the



blind resentment of people suffering and smarting from the long tribulation of a great economic depression. It may be conceded that this element does enter into these questionings; it may even be conceded that the suffering has been the catalytic agent which has precipitated this new spirit and its expression. There is nothing novel about the process. Steel is not the less steel because it is the residuum of the fiery processes of the blast furnaces and converters.

There is, however, more than blind resentment in this new spirit. There is a willingness to support great and unusual policies, even though there be no immediate prospect of direct benefit to the supporting individuals. This is well exemplified in the remarkable national support which has been unstintingly given to President Roosevelt in a legislative program of vast scope and of admittedly unorthodox and unprecedented nature. Undoubtedly this support has been an expression of the people's belief that he is sincere in purpose, and, in the main, right in method.

The purpose of the greater part of the national legislation since last March is an effort to implement that spirit in the economic field, which is aggressively demanding fair play for *all* in business and finance. In this demand "all" is used in its most inclusive sense,—not only all as individuals, but all as members of a collective social body, the nation.

This legislation has given rise to and will probably give rise in the future to many questions of constitutional law. As this is not a treatise on constitutional law, I shall leave this phase of the subject for the attention of those who are learned in jurisprudence. From a reading of our national history, we may, however, get the assurance that, provided the legislative remedies are in themselves sound and adapted to the major social and economic objectives of the people, they will not be vitiated by any narrow spirit of literal construction of the fundamental law. The history of the American people shows the adaptability of their philosophy of life and their concepts of law to conform with true progress and changing conditions.

On January 8, 1934, the Supreme Court of the United States, in a decision on the Minnesota mortgage moratorium, gave a recent example of this adaptability. In the course of that decision, Chief Justice Hughes stated: "... that the question is . . . of the use of reasonable means to secure the economic structure upon which the good of all depends." Now, the NRA program has the definite purpose of securing that "economic structure upon which the good of all depends." NRA has a dual aspect—as an emergency measure and as a permanent social program in industry and business. Our primary concern in this discussion is with the latter phase.

It may be set down as axiomatic that the vital element in any business, for all business, is the existence of a market. Without a market there can be no profit, and without profit the business will not long endure. If we keep this important fact in mind, we find that NRA is the inevitable product of economic evolution in America, since Lee surrendered at Appomattox Court House in 1865. It was in the Civil War Reconstruction Era that

American industrial history really began. It was in the succeeding years that its basic long-term trends were really set.

The West was being filled. The last frontier was thrown open to settlement on April 22, 1889, with the opening of the Indian Territory. By the time the census of 1890 was taken, the frontier had disappeared from the American scene. The country's population at the turn of the century, according to the 1900 census, was 76,000,000. In 1910 it was 92,000,000, an increase of over twenty per cent. During the first decade and a half of this century, the wave of immigration reached its crest. During this era came the automobile, with its consequent spread of good roads all over the nation. There was a rapid rise in the average standard of living. Our exports, from being preponderantly agricultural, became more and more industrial in nature. These various trends, which reached their culmination in the War years, 1914-1918, and in the immediately succeeding years, could all be summed up in the phrase, *expanding markets*.

When we turn to the picture which first began to appear with some clarity in 1920, after the end of the War, we find many contrasts. Immigration was restricted, eventually almost to the point of cessation. The birth rate's decline became fully evident. In the nearly quarter-century which has elapsed since 1910, the rate of increase in the population has declined to approximately sixteen per cent per decade, as compared with over twenty per cent in the first decade of the century.

It is the opinion of highly regarded authorities on vital statistics that the country's population will become more or less stationary in the course of the next ten to fifteen years. This stabilization has a commercial significance quite apart from the absolute decrease in the number of new individuals. A population which has reached or is so close to reaching stability is necessarily a more mature population. It contains a higher proportion of individuals of mature years, than does one which is increasing rapidly. In short, it has a higher average age. Such a population is not so susceptible as is a younger population to new demands, appeals of new merchandise, new services, new ideas generally. It is not setting up so many new homes, with the tremendous demand thereby created for building materials, furniture, household supplies, clothing, and all that the creation of new families implies.

The reconstruction of Europe, which stimulated industrial activity just after the close of the War, is finished. Europe is not only reconstructed, she is industrially re-equipped with modern machinery. She still retains her relatively low wage scales and the two, in combination, have made her a far more formidable competitor in those world markets, which were already beginning to absorb our surplus industrial production. All these various factors can be summed up in the phrase, *contracting markets*.

Contemporaneously with these basic factors working toward restriction of our potential markets, we had a tremendous increase in production facilities. This increase was not confined by any means to the War period alone.

It was actually stimulated by the momentum gained in that period and by the expanding market forces which carried forward from first two decades of the century.

The coincidence of these two sets of major factors, contracting markets and increasing production facilities, appeals to the present writer as a major proximate cause of the depression. A similar view has been set forth by other, and internationally known economists, as to other countries.

It is important to note that not one of the contributing factors which we have mentioned is of a temporary or cyclical nature. They are permanent trends. Their very presence, not to say their effect, was concealed for several years after they became operative. The concealment was due to the apparently unlimited growth in the wealth of a young country in the later stages of its exploitation era; to the accidents of war; to the great increase in the use of instalment selling; and to the credit inflation which had its inception in the colossal War loans.

The modern capitalist system has come to rest on the continued successful operation of industrial mass production. Industrial mass production itself is absolutely dependent for successful operation on mass consumption. At this point enters into the situation one of those upsetting contradictions to which the laissez-faire economic philosophy continually gives rise—when allowed to work out to its ultimate conclusion.

By force of natural selection, owners of capital are and always will be in a minority in any organized society. To that minority profits naturally revert. Those profits are the final increase in a country's permanent economic wealth. Yet, by the limitations of nature, the recipients cannot possibly spend anything but a fraction of that increment. Naturally and necessarily they re-invest it in capital assets, which, by their very nature, must be mainly more production facilities.

By these perfectly natural steps, new wealth is diverted from the channels of consumption, where it is needed to maintain the industrial machine; and added to production facilities, where, by increasing production, it overbalances supply, reduces sales and thereby strikes back at the capitalistic interests of its owners, and through them at the economic welfare of the nation.

In the battle arising from the impact of increased production facilities on contracted markets, there arose all manner of unsound competitive, wage, selling, and operating practices, which drove a knife into the very heart of the laissez-faire philosophy. Originally that concept of economic life was predicated upon the assumption that competition would be not only *free* but *fair*. It was also predicated upon the free and fair development of their beloved "economic man." Unless that mythical individual had a reasonably free and fair choice of economic action, he became not a factor, but a legend of the past.

Competition was not fair. It depends upon the strictness with which the word is to be construed whether one can say that competition was "free." The lack of fairness, and the dubious freedom for many smaller tradesmen and manufacturers, were at the roots of the "profit-

less prosperity," of which we heard so much in 1928-1929. That profitless prosperity was the sinister shadow, all unrecognized, of the disaster to come.

This was not a simple case of over-production. That is cyclical and time might remedy it. It was something far deeper. By probing to the deep cause, the solution, the permanent solution, is indicated.

In physics, chemistry, mechanics, in all the sciences, we have natural laws. The influence of these laws is well recognized, even where their nature may not be fully understood. Eminent scientists are even now working on experiments to demonstrate the essential unity of these various natural laws—striving to formulate a sort of master law. Seeing that we know that all created things and forces have a Common Source, this scientific hypothesis is entirely reasonable.

It is also entirely reasonable to believe that there are certain all-powerful cosmic laws pervading the universe, showing themselves to us as the so-called natural laws of science, morals—and of economics. One of the most powerful of these laws or forces is *equilibrium*, also called the Law of Compensation. Things out of balance must inevitably come back to balance or collapse. Outgo must be balanced by income; production must be balanced by consumption; assets must equal liabilities.

We have seen that the old system of laissez-faire created a most appalling disequilibrium, a total lack of balance between production and consumption. To call this over-production would be to admit that permanently our economic system was out of balance—a confession of futility, and of despair. Upon careful consideration, we find, not over-production, but only an excess of production over the means of consumption, as *those means were visualized in the old order*.

That lack of balance can be corrected by increasing the means of consumption. To restore that balance is the basic objective of NRA. It is seeking the restoration by forcing a larger proportion of newly created wealth into channels of consumption, where it is obviously needed. Simultaneously, NRA and other parts of the Administration's program tend to divert that economic profit, that increment of new wealth, from channels where experience and common sense alike tell us it will freeze into capital assets as more means of production, of which we already have ample.

#### ASH WEDNESDAY

With strange prophetic light  
The old priest, after Mass,  
On every brow will write  
What things shall come to pass:

That life shall have its fill—  
Will flee from everyone;  
And then of what stuff will  
The coat of death be spun.

Now God be thanked that slime,  
Through His great Charity,  
Can wisely walk with Time  
And wear Eternity.

CHARLES M. CAREY, C.S.C.



## A Certain Politician

GEORGE CARVER

**Y**OU and I—we both know him. He is between fifty and sixty-five, of ruddy complexion, and of a vigor beyond comparison with either of us. He has a pleasant-faced wife and four or five sons and daughters, all of whom we look upon as mainstays of the community.

We see him regularly at Mass and just as regularly at the Communion railing. We hear of him serving upon various committees in connection with parish affairs; he is invaluable, for instance, when building permits are required, when extra policemen are needed for the eleven-o'clock traffic snarl in front of the church, and even in trifles like the assistant pastor's forgetting his parking light. Furthermore, he is invariably willing and amply able to aid in whatever charity is brought to his attention. Poor relief, missions, educational projects—all share his gifts. Besides, he has private charities, which come but vaguely to the ears of the parish: distressed widows, orphans, old men out of work, poor seminarians, and the like. In short, he is a practising Catholic, careful in his observances and concerned about the welfare of those less fortunate than himself—and to such degree as to deserve not only our respect but our emulation as well.

And yet is he either the one or deserving of the other? About his private life, his relations with his family, his friends, and his church, no word may be spoken except in highest praise. His wife and children not only love but admire him, his intimates extol his virtues, and his pastor thinks him the salt of the earth. But what about the rest of the world?

I—and possibly you—work for the city. We know him in his everyday guise as the power behind municipal affairs, screened perhaps from direct contact by a regiment of henchmen, but well known nevertheless to the people at large. Through his henchmen he controls elections. As they deliver the vote so do they reap their reward—in the form of protection for whatever nefarious undertakings they choose to engage in. We know about Madame Nemo, for example, and her multiple establishments; about Pascale Giardini and the "numbers"; about Jefferson Jackson and his "black-and-tan" resorts; and about Nick Polanski and his liquor trucks—not to mention what happened to the ballot boxes in the Sixtieth Ward after the last election.

We know about this sort of thing—all of us, and so does the city in general. In so far as the city is concerned, very few persons know about our friend's impeccable private life; all they consider is his political activity. Not any of us who think approve. We vote against him and against his candidates—some of us secretly, of course—but our vote seldom counts; his organization is too perfect.

None the less we wonder, we who know both sides of him. What sort of man is this? He gives with both hands,

not only of his wealth but also of his spirit; yet he just as readily takes with both hands and in a manner which should blacken his soul for all eternity. He has the choir loft augmented; he takes care of repairs to the organ; and he has maintained Mrs. O'Halloran's youngest all through St. Swithin's. But how is one to interpret these acts in the light of altered ballots, bribed juries, falsified public accounts, protected vice, and unjailed killers?

Our non-Catholic acquaintances who know of his religious affiliation attribute his apparently paradoxical activities to hypocrisy, and in their ignorance of things Catholic think of his charities as self-imposed penance in the salving of a guilty conscience; or perhaps the half-read among them explain matters in terms of the ever-popular but ludicrously erroneous "end-justifies-the-means" philosophy. Catholics, however, if one may judge from their silence, from their seeming acceptance of the situation—for they cannot be unaware that it exists; hence their silence can be construed only as condonation—Catholics who could do something remain entirely passive.

And it is not surprising that they do. As a matter of fact, the Catholic politician described here (one knows, of course, that there are upright Catholic politicians just as there are of other faiths) is neither a hypocrite nor an "end-justifies-the-means" philosopher. He is a practical Catholic as a private citizen and a public enemy as a city official. His activities are separated into two groups, the one wholly admirable, the other utterly despicable—deny it who can. And the reason, although not apparent, perhaps, is not too far to seek.

The conditions under which such a one develops are the inevitable result of our political evolution. In the beginning rulers of no matter what degree held themselves strictly accountable to God or they soon heard from their confessors; public affairs were as much affairs of conscience as the most intimate concerns. Almost every chapter of ancient history attests the truth of the assertion.

With the dawn of the Renaissance, however, and the preoccupation of men like Machiavelli, Guicciardini, San-sovino, Bacon, Elyot, and Pedro de Mexia with their philosophy of government, expediency, not conscience, became the motivation, and the separation of things temporal and things spiritual emerged inevitably. Such separation as a legality was one concern—and one of proportions far beyond the scope of this paper—and the suppression of conscience in State affairs quite another. The first tended to affect the second to a degree quite out of keeping with any logical necessity, although the result was the same in the end. The temporal and the spiritual being separate in fact, it was but a short time before they became separate in ideal.

Coupled with this influence, indeed a not-unapparent

item in it, moreover, appeared forces aiming at the destruction of faith. At first they were directed against the Church; later they were hurled against Christ; and still later they were gathered together into a united attack against the very conception of God; until today so successful has the onslaught been that the proportion of practising Christians seems to grow ever smaller, and such small practice as is in evidence is hardly concerned with government. Outwardly, of course, religion does not pass unnoticed in government; but it is almost invariably relegated to orations to Deity on such occasions as the opening of legislative bodies, national conventions, and meetings of similar ilk. Government in the light of the Sermon on the Mount is unthinkable.

And yet why should it be? Suppose this politician whom you and I know were to carry over into the conduct of his office the spirit that pervades his private life. The taxpayers would rejoice exceedingly if they were regarded as judiciously as are the poor in our parish.

And what about the able men kept out of office by a machine which battens upon incompetence? Or the victims of lotteries operated at absurd odds? The dupes of Madame Nemo? The families of those dead at the hands of gangsters? Our friend knows that these evils exist; he has a hand in promoting some of them, if not directly at least by implication. But he considers them as necessary concomitants in government. They touch him chiefly by way of maintaining him in office. It is almost—not quite—as if he had no will in the matter. He is the natural offspring of our political system.

But what if he and all situated as he is were to inject the spirit of their religion into their political lives! How long would bad government continue? Or suppose that he were to make use of the integrity in the world beyond his fireside that he uses in governing his sons? Or better still, suppose that he were to approach the confessional with his conscience as heavily burdened with his political crimes as it is with his private sins. . . .

### Economics

## Has the Government Guaranteed Your Deposit?

HORACE C. WHITEMAN

**T**HE faith and credit of the Government of the United States is not pledged to guarantee bank depositors from losses. The Banking Act of 1933 provided, among other things, for the insurance in limited amounts of deposits in banks, such insurance being supplied by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, an entity incorporated by Congress for the purpose. The contribution to the new corporation by the Treasury is limited to \$150,000,000. The Federal Reserve Banks contribute an amount equal to one-half of their surplus funds as of January 1, 1933, which contribution approximates \$139,000,000. The constituent banks admitted to membership in the guaranty fund supply the remainder of the capital. After allowing for the value of the assets of the bank, the capital of this corporation is the only guaranty to the depositor that he will suffer no loss on that part of his deposit which is insured. The contributions by the Treasury and the Federal Reserve Banks are definite and limited. In theory the contributions to the permanent insurance fund by the banks (national, State, trust companies, etc.) are indefinite and unlimited. In practice, however, prohibitive assessments accelerate withdrawals from membership by the banks and they form the backbone of the plan. The contributions by the banks to the temporary fund are limited to an aggregate of one per cent of the deposit liabilities of the qualifying member.

The temporary insurance fund became operative January 1, 1934, and ceases June 30, 1934. It provides insurance of 100 per cent, but not to exceed \$2,500, for deposits in the banks admitted to the fund. The permanent insurance feature becomes effective July 1, 1934, and provides insurance in accordance with the following provisions of the Act:

For the purpose of this subsection, the term insured deposit liability shall mean with respect to the owner of any claim arising out of a deposit liability of such closed bank the following percentages of the net amount due to such owner by such closed bank on account of deposit liabilities: 100 per centum of such net amount not exceeding \$10,000; and 75 per centum of the amount, if any, by which such net amount exceeds \$10,000 but does not exceed \$50,000; and 50 per centum of the amount, if any, by which such net amount exceeds \$50,000.

Both the small bank and the small depositor are favored in one respect. The 100 per cent insurance feature of the temporary fund is applicable to the deposit up to \$2,500, and in the case of the permanent fund the full insurance is extended to balances up to \$10,000. The community bank account comes within these brackets and in those cases where the balance is larger it may cause the shifting of some accounts and the allocating of the deposit to a number of banks to obtain complete protection. For the time being, at least, the small institution is in a position to bid deposits away from its larger competitor.

The closing paragraph of that section of the Banking Act dealing with deposit insurance has this to say:

It is not the purpose of this section to discriminate, in any manner, against State non-member, and in favor of, national or member banks; but the purpose is to provide all banks with the same opportunity and to obtain and enjoy the benefits of this section.

This bid for support must have been framed with tongue in cheek, for the crowning achievement of the Act was one of discrimination. All members of the Federal Reserve System, which includes all licensed national banks and less than 800 State banks and trust companies, are automatically admitted to the temporary fund whether solvent or insolvent, whereas non-member State banks and trust companies must be certified to be solvent by the State supervisor of banking, and then they are examined



by examiners of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. The use of a drastic formula for determining the solvency of applying non-member State banks is a further assurance that insolvent State banks will not secure the benefits of this Act. There could be no just complaint about the formula if it were applied to all banks without discrimination, so that the insolvent member bank, be it national or State, was eliminated before it became an insurable risk of the corporation. As this is written, there is no evidence that any such action will be taken by either the Federal Reserve Board or the Comptroller of the Currency, so the result is likely to be that all operating members of the Federal Reserve System automatically have their deposits insured from January 1, 1934, while only the solvent State banks will be accorded the privilege. The natural sequence is that the good assets of the solvent non-member State banks become subject to assessments to make good losses of insolvent national or State member banks drafted into the group of insurable risks.

It does not help the situation to assume that all banks, whether national or State, member or non-member, will later be treated alike when membership in the permanent insurance fund is being considered. If the national bank cannot qualify for the permanent fund it may elect to close before withdrawing from the temporary fund, or before it is denied the privilege of the permanent fund, in which event the resources of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will be used to make up any deficit in its assets needed for the payment of insured deposits.

The severe rule adopted by the directors of the Corporation for determining the solvency of the applying non-member State bank furthered the discrimination in the Act. No one sincerely interested in a sound solvent banking system could quarrel, in normal times, with a formula which eliminates all losses, depreciation, and doubtful assets, but it unduly penalizes the non-member bank, when competition compels it to have deposit insurance if it is to survive, because the same rule is not applied to the national and State member bank. In fact there is no rule adopted in advance by the corporation for these banks since they automatically became members of the insurance corporation on January 1, unless the national bank elected to surrender its national charter or the State member bank gave up its membership in the Federal Reserve System.

At the outset the directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation were faced with a trying dilemma. If they adopted harsh measures and denied admittance to the temporary fund of weak or insolvent banks (i.e., insolvent according to their formula), they might revive the wave of bank failures and upset the entire recovery program of the President. If they employed an easy-going policy and admitted many insolvent institutions to the benefits of the plan, these would later become the source of severe losses. Either of the alternative decisions had grave possibilities for harm to the present banking situation.

But these problems are merely representative of those arising out of belated moves to correct fundamental dis-

orders. A life insurance company which insured a substantial number of sick applicants would not long remain solvent. Likewise an insurance scheme, to afford protection to bank depositors from the capital assets of the bank, rather than from premiums paid by those who benefit, adopted without first disposing of bad assets and all uninsurable risks, is bound to have an interesting result. There is this one consolation: that consolidations, restrictions, and closings have eliminated much of the weakness from our banking structure, and while the innocent depositor has borne the burden of the resulting hardships and losses, the system has been purged of a goodly number of insolvent institutions.

If the precarious existence of several thousand banks is now to be decided by the failure to obtain insurance benefits under this Act, it might be a better expedient to have the Reconstruction Finance Corporation make loans to this group sufficient in amount to pay off the deposits and let the Government absorb the resulting losses, rather than to suffer a revival of the conditions which led up to the suspension of all of our banks last March. By emphasis upon the soundness of the bank which has its deposits insured and, by indirection, stigmatizing the one which does not, even though it might be the stronger and more liquid, we are surely preparing the stage for a repetition of our past folly.

It is daily becoming more apparent that certain of our Federal Government agencies are committed to a program of eliminating the State banking systems as a preliminary to the intermediate condition of a unified banking system. The ultimate goal is nation-wide branch banking. Then we shall be in need of protection when the control of our banking resources and credit facilities are concentrated in the hands of a few who, conceivably, might happen to be a select group of financial pirates. The systematic campaign to discredit first the State banking systems is only a prerequisite to alienating the affections of their friends. This accomplished, the extermination process is simplified.

Further to facilitate the domination by agencies of the national Government, the Banking Act of 1933 provided that all banks to continue to receive the benefits of the insurance plan must become members of the Federal Reserve System on or before July 1, 1936. When there are no State banking systems to impede the program, it will be an easy matter to get rid of the small community bank. Then, indeed, shall we face the giant bank with branches in every State, whose power may well exceed that of the Government itself. To cite only one example of the trend, the recent alignment of the National City Bank of New York with the Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association in California, and its parent the Transamerica Corporation, through the election of A. P. Giannini to the board of directors of the former, is of more than ordinary significance.

In the final analysis this struggle for supremacy in banking resolves itself into a contest on the right of a State to maintain its own system of banking in competition with one chartered by Congress. It is State vs. Federal Rights. Unless the States soon wake up, they will not possess

any banking systems. If for no other reason, they should consider the effect upon their revenues of the removal of the capital of their banks from the field of State taxation, and the transfer of a corresponding amount to that of the Federal Government. With all the States also dependent upon creatures of Congress for financial aid, it would be an intriguing study to determine how they could be sure of financing their future requirements. The one who commands the cash and the credit frequently controls the destiny of the would-be borrower. Are the States about to surrender another of their constitutional prerogatives, to their everlasting regret?

This plan to insure deposits has many ramifications but one fact transcends all others. The Government of the United States has not yet guaranteed your deposit.

## Education

### Teaching Religion

DANIEL M. O'CONNELL, S.J.

YOU will find this subject a perennial topic of discussion at every gathering of Catholic educators from a national assembly, such as that of the National Catholic Educational Association, to the municipal gathering of Catholic college faculties or student bodies, or to the local college's department of religious instruction. The same is true in similar meetings of high schools, and I have no doubt of our parish schools, though unfortunately I lack personal experience with the latter. "Teaching Religion" is now a battle cry with Catholic educators. I do not think it flamboyant to say that they have become crusaders in the cause. A more modern expression might term the movement a National Recovery Act, without, of course, any criticism of the past, or self-glorification of the present. My most recent reaction to this virile manifestation of apostolic Catholicity was had at the annual Christmas meeting of the principals, and later of the deans, in Jesuit high schools and colleges of the Chicago and Missouri Provinces. In both gatherings the discussion sought to bring out better methods, possibly better texts, and better allocation of students and time schedules in the teaching of religion.

Naturally the high school's problems demand a different code from that of the college. Catholic secondary schools are largely recruited from parish schools, and so in matters of religious instruction the pupils are not under a handicap from a lack of previous training. In the matter of teachers, too, the high school's religion classes, though they ideally should be taught by priests, due to their professional training, may be very well and enthusiastically conducted by Scholastics, Brothers, and Sisters. An exception would probably be in fourth-year high, where every effort should be made to have a priest as instructor and counselor.

In praise of all religion instructors, latest reports are most encouraging. In high school and college, we are told, there is a renewed and enthusiastic zeal on the part

of teachers of religion. True, it is most natural. Have not priests received the Divine command, "Go ye and teach all nations"? Again, the Pope's urging of Catholic Action inspires all the Faithful to do their assigned part in spreading Christ's Church. Now the teaching of catechism has always characterized every estate of men and women of apostolic zeal. Names in illustration crowd the mind. The saintly Pius X regarded it as a chief instrument in renewing the modern world to Christ. St. Charles Borromeo might be called its patron for the hierarchy. St. Ignatius Loyola knew of no more efficient weapon for his counter-reformation, and would have his best theologians vow to teach catechism to the poorly instructed for a prescribed period of time. Foundresses of religious institutes for women have been urged forward in their holy designs by the greater opportunity to conduct catechism classes through a religious organization.

Why wonder then at the present-day zeal of catechists, animated by current methods of arousing interest? The question is rather how to restrain universal zeal. Administrators, presidents and deans, principals and treasurers; specialists, heads of departments, professors trained for years in an academic branch, crowned with their respective laureate, and devoted to research in that subject; seminarians and Scholastics, not yet ordained, Brothers and Sisters, all plead to exercise their virtue of catechetical zeal through this opportunity open to them in their own house. It is not necessary for their superiors to urge that advantage be taken of such a family heritage. Rather, prudence must temper enthusiasm. While insisting on a well-organized religion department in our schools, I would not see this zeal for the Lord's house denied even to administrators and specialists, *ipso facto*. Perhaps it is their only opportunity for a direct work of zeal. Or take the case of the priest-professor of a secular branch. Through his weekly religion classes, he is brought into a new contact with students; he enlarges his occasion for personal influence, and opens the spiritual eyes of his students to their priest-professor's dual role.

Authors actually used in high-school religion classes will always be another proof of that thoroughly mellowed in the ages toast, *de gustibus*. Father Campion is very popular. In Jesuit high schools, Father Cassilly for some years has supplanted the venerable Father Deharbe, at least in the first three years. In the fourth year, some repeat the whole Cassilly, others take Father Laux's excellent books, or Father Conway's "Question Box," arranged according to a syllabus drawn up for convert classes, and followed with success by theological students at St. Louis University in these classes. At times Father Laux's excellent Church history is used in fourth-year high, while there is an increasing interest in a liturgy course in the same year, Father Sullivan's "Externals of the Catholic Church" being a popular text.

Personally, I am of the opinion that in fourth-year high, and especially in college classes, instructors in religion should be allowed a wide latitude in the choice of texts and even of matter, provided the latter conforms to



a well-planned syllabus, approved by proper authorities. An instructor will teach with most enthusiasm the text and subject matter which personally appeal to him. This fact also explains what is sometimes called a "one-man text." The author has put so much of his own personality in the book, that others find great difficulty in using the text according to their natural or acquired methods of teaching.

Fortunately in collegiate texts of religion, there is a large and growing spate. The venerable Wilmers has yielded graciously to younger blood. He did yeoman service, and there are those who still chant his praises. I know of a prominent Catholic lawyer who volunteered the information that Wilmers, in his geometric-like processes, was one of the best preparations for law. Archbishop Sheehan's texts have the Wilmers thoroughness, with a welcome touch of modern illustrations. The same can be said for the more detailed series written by the Jesuit Fathers of the New York-Maryland Province, Doyle, Herzog, and Chetwood. "Religion Courses for Colleges," by Rev. John M. Cooper, cut a new trail in teaching methods for the advancement of the apostolic deposit of faith. Its wide success is a well merited tribute to its author's courage and ability. The latest treasure trove is being unearthed in the new Bruce series, edited by the Jesuit Fathers, Lord, Morrison, and Ellard. The instant popularity of their texts with instructor and student is little short of the phenomenal.

In college, the allocation of freshmen to their proper religion class is more difficult than in high school, as the former frequently come from non-Catholic secondary schools. The only practical solution is to assign such Catholic students to a separate freshmen class, a "survey class," as it is sometimes called. For this, Father Cassilly's text has been found most useful. Non-Catholic students are allowed, though not required, to take this and the regular religion courses. Another arrangement obligatory on such non-Catholic students is had in some Catholic colleges through orientation courses in the junior college, and philosophy of life courses in the senior college. These are based on the fundamental principles of psychology, ethics, theodicy, and parts of metaphysics. I quote a summary of one such course from the Creighton University catalogue: "Spiritual and social values. An investigation and discussion of man's place in the universe. The responsibilities of a free, intellectual, moral being with particular reference to the problems of the present day. Required of non-Catholic sophomores. Two credit hours."

A challenge to our American initiative comes from India, where much good work along similar lines has been done for non-Catholic students, and has been systematized in such excellent textbooks as "Moral Science," a four-years' course of moral instruction for college students, by the Rev. D. Ferroli, S.J., St. Aloysius College, Mangalore, and "Practical Philosophy of Life," by the Rev. Ernest R. Hull, S.J.

At Creighton University, during the annual retreat for

Catholic students, separate "Conferences on a Philosophy of Life" are obligatory on the non-Catholic student. These correspond in time and number to the exercises of the Catholic retreat.

Contrast our well-organized syllabus of teaching the most momentous fact in all history, that of God-made-Man, and all its implications for our personal lives, the unwavering knowledge and consequent enthusiasm of our instructors, the corresponding eagerness of our students to learn, with the pitiable position of non-Catholic institutions as expressed in an article, entitled "Religious Instruction at Michigan" in the *Educational Record* of the American Council on Education (January, 1934). Professor Ruthven writes: "In religion it (the University of Michigan) is pro-nothing and anti-nothing, but Catholic and Protestant and Jewish and Mohammedan and Buddhist, and every other faith with a philosophy worth study and adoption." The Catholic college student would answer in our Saviour's virile words to the contrary, "He who believeth not shall be condemned."

### With Scrip and Staff

C HERRY blossoms entirely surrounded by space. St. Teresa (pronounced St. Teressa) seated not standing. Seated not standing. Not seated not standing yet not half-and-half standing. St. Teresa surrounded by many people. Surrounded by saints. Two saints. Three saints. Many saints! ALL saints! This is the first act. This is scene one. Scenes two and three (says the *Compère*, or end-man)—usefully—

Of Gertrude Stein's opera "Four Saints in Three Acts." Or rather it isn't the first act; and it isn't any scene in the first act. But it is all the Pilgrim was able to get from the first act. After that he lost his head. Not his head but his hat. Hat without a head? Head without a hat? Leave it to the saints, many saints, all saints. Hear it set to impressive and poignant music, conducted by the dynamic Alexander Smallens, and interpreted by splendid choruses in solemn ballet; the tempo ranging from the sedateness of a minuet to the comparative speed of a Victorian garden party. Superb soloists. Actors all Negroes. Not as Negroes, not written for Negroes, but chosen by the composer, Virgil Thomson, for their skill and voices. Slight inaccuracy on the part of the *Literary Digest*, February 3, 1934, page 21, which informs us: "The singers are all Negroes. They do not know what the words mean and do not care. They like the mystery of intelligibility." My impression was that the Negroes *were* somewhat worried, at least at first, by the unintelligibility of the Steinian words. So "St. Ignatius": Edward Matthews. But they were the words to be sung; and that ended it. Usefully.

W HO would not be worried? Many people, saints and not saints, will be somewhat annoyed by the curious incongruity between passionate, heartrending

chords and words that sound like reminiscences of an Ollendorff exercise book, with an endless repetition of the magic word "saints." Many people will be annoyed. But will they come when they are annoyed? That is a question which the management of the opera will have to ask themselves. Usefully.

Putting aside annoyance, however, some solution may be attempted of the riddle, if it is a riddle. Gertrude's idea seems to be a baroque fantasia. She wishes to convey to the spectator and hearer the vague general impression of how baroque appears to her; of what she particularly loves in baroque: its contained grandeur, its dignity of high noon and blue skies.

But this is not done too seriously. It is ironical; seriously ironical or ironically serious. The passionate choruses set to walk-in-the-park words may be a mild satire on most operas, where after all you rarely hear the words; and when you do, find you have not gained much.

She conveys, too, in a strange way, the impression that a spiritually illiterate person receives from the accidentals of the Catholic liturgy. To such a person, the chanted lessons of the Church, the intonations and movements, appear solemn yet inconsequential: grave announcements of the inexplicable. Not that she resents this; she enjoys it, as the most precious element in the baroque. Her attitude toward it is of interest; of pleasure; possibly of something deeper, a sense that there is something profound and meaningful beneath these forms. So with an immense number of moderns; a nostalgia for something they have lost. Yet she remains slightly ironical.

St. Teresa and St. Ignatius are but symbols of this something in the baroque which lifts it above a gorgeous garden party. They are the foci of baroque dignity, restraint, expansiveness. They are vaguely reminiscent of a vaguely apprehended period: agreeable figures: St. Teresa is two figures, one who sings, one who postures. They have many conversations: pleasant conversations. These symbols are chosen because for some reason or other Gertrude Stein does like the historical Teresa and Ignatius, or what she knows about them. But in the opera they remain mere symbols.

And above all not to be taken too seriously. Cherry blossoms surrounded by space. Usefully? I do not know.

TO those who find the supernatural inexplicable, it is always profitable to point out the good effects that come, even in the purely natural order, from acts inspired by a supernatural motive. The fasts of the Church, for instance, are a familiar theme; and the early Fathers of the Church, St. Gregory or St. Ambrose, loved to dwell upon the natural benefit of fasting.

Recently the Pilgrim had a conversation with a famous non-Catholic scientist upon this very point—a man who has devoted his life to medical research. "What is your principal difficulty, Doctor," I asked, "with your research workers?" "Lack of imagination," was the reply. "The great obstacle to progress in research in the United States is lack of imagination. My young men are industrious,

they are conscientious, but they cannot progress beyond a certain point. They stick just *there*."

"What do you attribute this to?"

"Too much food; too little fasting!" was the reply. "Food," continued the Doctor, "interferes with the growth of the imagination. Our young Americans are too well-fed."

Further questioning brought out that the Doctor admitted other causes as well, of a more spiritual nature, such as lack of general culture and of spiritual ideals; a lack which naturally narrows the mind. Still, the physical played its part; and he was backed up in his theory by his experiments with mice.

"I tried," said the Doctor—if I quote him correctly—"the ecclesiastical fasts upon the mice: making them abstain completely from food two or three days out of the week, and feeding them generously on the other days. Result? Somewhat smaller mice; but with keener intelligence. Just so with human beings. If they do not eat so much, particularly if they observe the fasts of the Church, they will not grow so large and so tall, but they will be more active and more intelligent. Our youth are growing too large. (N. B. The Doctor is not large.) And with it they are losing their imagination."

Was there anything in what he said? I remembered that the greatest outpourings of Christian imagination were in the days when men observed most faithfully Catholic feast and fast. But the thought may help Lent a little. Usefully.

THE PILGRIM.

## Literature

### The Lights of Home

CATHERINE ROCKWELL CHRISTOPHER

LAST year, which was the centenary of the Oxford movement, recalls the history of that glorious reversion to the Catholic Church of so many of England's greatest personages. From its inception at the time of John Keble's Assize sermon on "National Apostasy," tractarianism has continued its progress down to the present day. Its ramifications have extended from the fields of religion and theology to those of education and literature.

Among the foremost contemporary exemplars of the influence of the Oxford movement on literature is Alfred Noyes. The Catholic Church formally received him in 1929. In a still wider sense, however, like Chesterton, Noyes had always been a Catholic. His philosophy has always been orthodox, and all his psychological tendencies have been toward the doctrines of the Church of Peter. The occasion of his conversion was the realization that there was an absolute identity between his own beliefs and those of the Catholic Church. That he should openly and publicly subscribe to the tenets of that faith was therefore inevitable.

Noyes was born in England and was educated at Oxford. He must have admired his glorious predecessors, Newman and Digby, for the Tractarian movement, then



as now, was a potent force at the university. Doubtless he felt its influence. But however external forces may have been brought to bear upon him, Noyes depended but little upon them. He needed no impetus, no aid, save that which is the simplest and yet the greatest of all—faith. Faith is the attribute of a humble mind, for it is only the humble who can realize that the limitations of the human intellect do not perforce limit the infinity of truth. Only the fool professes to comprehend perfection with the imperfect instrument that is the human mind. Alfred Noyes explicitly admits his own incapacity, and consequently his poetry is vividly conscious of faith.

The poetry of Alfred Noyes may be divided into two classes. The first class includes such poems as "The Highwayman," "The Admiral's Ghost," "Dick Turpin's Ride," and others that, as romantic poems, are true representatives of the type. Their interest lies in their narrative appeal. As vehicles for the expression of faith, they are not un-Catholic, for the Church has ever been concomitant with romanticism. So close, in fact, is this association that the Roman Catholic Church and Romanticism are descended from the same etymological parent.

However, it is on the second class of poetry that one may rely to furnish proof of Noyes' Catholicism. In this group are included those poems that might be called super-romantic; poems of spiritual autobiography, poems concerning problems that are age-old and ever new. Throughout these poems, there is a positive demonstration of belief in the Catholic Church, and the overshadowing theme manifests Noyes' emotional and intellectual receptiveness to Catholicism.

Outcroppings of intense sensuous enthusiasm for things Catholic are most evident in them. Noyes does not soar on Francis Thompson's mystic wings, but nevertheless he too is keenly aware of the face of God hidden behind the veil of nature. In "The Quest Renewed" he sings almost ecstatically,

I stretch my hand out still,  
O Light of Life, to Thee,  
Who leav'st an Olivet in each far blue hill,  
A sorrow on every sea.

And again,

Hark what wild throats pour His praise  
Beneath the boundless blue.

Thus Noyes was able to distinguish nicely between pantheism and mysticism. He was able to elevate the sensuous to a supernatural plane—and that is one part of Catholic mysticism.

This emotional appreciation of the Catholic Church is indeed great, but, in his intellectual appreciation, Noyes evidences an even deeper sincerity and love for the faith into which he is newly come.

Perhaps the best way in which to show how truly Catholic in spirit was Noyes' poetry even in his pre-Catholic days is to contrast his work with that of Matthew Arnold. The two strikingly exemplify how wide may be the divergence of interpretation of the problems of life by men whose external circumstances have been practically the same.

Noyes believes in the wealth of humanly unknowable truth; Arnold assumes an attitude of indifference toward that which his mind cannot comprehend. "Dover Beach," representing Arnold's philosophy, is as essentially agnostic as Noyes' poetry is Catholic. Arnold articulated the materialistic tendencies of his age; but Noyes, greater than his age, voices verities immutable in time.

In "Dover Beach" Arnold interpreted life in much the same manner as the blind men of India visualized the elephant—by basing his conception of it on a necessarily limited experience. To Noyes, the more favored, has been granted the experience of faith. As the protagonist of the philosophy of Catholicism, he is ever optimistic and happy. Arnold, as the champion of agnosticism, frames verses attuned to the "eternal note of sadness." This is not a mere happen-so. It is a deduction from the universal truth that true faith brings peace and contentment to one's life.

Arnold laments,

The sea of faith  
Was once too at the full and round earth's shore  
Lay like the folds of a bright girdle furled.  
But now I only hear  
Its melancholy long-withdrawing roar  
Retreating to the breath  
Of the night winds down the vast edges drear  
And naked shingles of the world.

In sharp contrast, Noyes conceives the sea as a symbol of hope. Of it he said,

Once more I hear the everlasting sea  
Breathing beneath the mountain's fragrant breast,  
"Come unto me, come unto me,  
And I will give you rest."

For one, the tide has ebbed, leaving only mocking relics on the now desolate shore "across the soul's gray wilderness where faith lay down to die." And for the other, the tide of faith brings from the distant caverns of the sea, rare treasures long hidden on the ocean floor.

The essential disagreement, therefore, between Noyes and Arnold is in their interpretations of those things which reason cannot encompass.

Noyes, neither materialist, nor fatalist, nor sensualist, ardently upholds the doctrines of the Catholic Church. Aptly he summarizes his philosophy of living,

Better to break your heart and die,  
Than, like your gaolers, to forget your sky.

He could not but admit with Arnold the inescapable reality of the "turbid ebb and flow of human misery"; but since he had recourse to the solace which faith affords, he could believe that in every unhappiness the wisdom and the providence of God sustains.

. . . music surroundeth us  
Whatsoever agonies entangle our feet.

And again,

Earth is in tumult but heaven is at rest,  
. . . Out of earth's anguish our heaven is born.

Alfred Noyes sought the Catholic Church as an artist seeks beauty, a philosopher truth, a mystic God. To his soul the Church of God must have been more than a wel-

come haven. He thus describes the end of his odyssey:

Pilot, how far from home?  
 Not far, not far tonight,  
 A flight of spray, a sea-bird's flight,  
 A flight of tossing foam,  
 And then the lights of home.  
 And yet again, how far?  
 And seems the way so brief?  
 Those lights beyond the roaring reef  
 Were lights of moon and star,  
 Far, far, none knows how far.  
 Pilot, how far from home?  
 The great stars pass away,  
 Before Him as a flight of spray,  
 Moons as a flight of foam,  
 I see the lights of home.

For him as for Hugh Benson the lights of its Sacrifice and its Sacraments shone as the cordial, beckoning lights of something more than a house or a place of refuge—it was home.

### REVIEWS

**The English Way.** Edited by MAISIE WARD. New York: Sheed and Ward. \$2.50.

The thesis of this is truly put by the editor, Maisie Ward, in the closing sentence of the introduction: "Those 'deep things which inhabit the native soul' make in each land its own special 'Way' of being Catholic." Sixteen English men and women, noted for their holiness—even though they be not officially held up by the Church—have been selected, from the time of St. Bede down to Cardinal Newman. Each life-story is contributed by a celebrated English Catholic writer, and it goes quite without saying that each is well told. The book is a companion volume to "The Irish Way" written a few years ago. The titles may and should be accepted affirmatively and not as disparaging other ways for as Father Martindale notes wisely (p. 240): "My personal conviction is that all nations are worth one another." Yet "grace builds on nature," and nature is accidentally different in the English, the Irish, the American, etc.; and so it will not be strange if the dominant traits of sanctity in each will be different, even though the large substratum of essential holiness differs. "For whatever is received, is received in the measure of the receptivity of the receiver."

F. P. LeB.

**John Hay.** By TYLER DENNETT. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company. \$5.00.

"From Poetry to Politics" is the characterization given by Professor Dennett to his biography of John Hay, Secretary of State under McKinley and Roosevelt, after all, no startling novelty in the lives of statesmen. But to picture the progress, if such it be, is no easy task, even though a biographer is supposed to revel in the reconciliation of apparent contradictions. John Hay "was both indolent and industrious; thrifty and extravagant; an esthete but not an idealist; an artist, veined with sentiments of a small-town Presbyterian. He could keep a cool head in a crisis, as during the siege of Peking, and yet he could express many intemperate judgments of both men and affairs. He was often called a snob, but he could catch the character of Jim Bludso and he could express the homely philosophy of the 'common, unthinking man.' Though popularly catalogued as an Anglophile, he nevertheless wrested from Great Britain outstanding diplomatic victories. Temperamentally alien to McKinley, and both temperamentally and intellectually at variance with Theodore Roosevelt, he nevertheless worked successfully with both men. Incidentally, Mr. Dennett pays some enlightening tributes to McKinley. The disappearance, in recent times, of the famous landmarks in Washington, John Hay's house and Henry Adams'

house adjoining, seems to symbolize the relegation of Hay, historically, to the end of the great "organizing" period in our history. Was not, after all, the fascination that Adams held for Hay, Clarence King, and others of that little group due not only to the fact that Adams represented detached criticism in an uncritical age; but also to the fact that with Adams' pessimism and cynicism, he did basically reverence things spiritual? If Adams could have had the courage and the hope to lift Hay spiritually—with himself—to that supernatural plane which he viewed, as it were, in a dream and afar off, Hay would have channeled his own boundless versatility, added some austerity to his fastidious nature, and been vastly greater not only as a statesman, but as a man. With it all, however, Hay remains lovable; and Mr. Dennett has written with the truth that comes from sober affection.

J. L. F.

**Crowded Hours.** By ALICE ROOSEVELT LONGWORTH. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. \$3.00.

The confession of the author that "at an early age I was a potentially effete member of my strenuous family" is nowhere justified in the continuously entertaining story she tells of the "crowded hours" of her reminiscences. Her recollections, going back to a childhood never unaware "of the existence of politics and politicians," and which caught the atmosphere of excitement in the daily life of her distinguished father, are replete with engagingly frank comment on the social and political sides of New York and Washington and vivid pen-portraits of the many notable men and women with whom she was brought into contact. Her intimation that Shane Leslie was in Washington, during the World War, "working to keep the Irish and Irish Americans in line," will be news indeed to both those sections of the body politic. The historic "Dear Maria" episode of her father's administration is mentioned casually, and with the conclusion: "The whole affair was more exasperating than important though a great pity to see an old friendship go on the rocks." Few recent books offer their readers so much material with so many phases of varied and special interest, picturing life in Washington.

T. F. M.

**The First Billion.** By JOHN K. WINKLER. New York: The Vanguard Press. \$2.50.

This book deals, as the subtitle reveals, with "the Stillmans and the National City Bank." And, within its limits, it deals competently with them. It is not replete with figures, nor permeated with facts; rather it is a sharp and cutting outline presented much as was "Washington Merry-Go-Round," and, more recently, "The Mirrors of Wall Street." It is for the man who wants a quick glance more than for the student of banking who wants to dig deeply into the history of the National City Bank. It tells what the elder Stillman was, rather than what he did. Beginning with Charles Stillman, Mr. Winkler traces the family through Charles' business experiences in Mexico, Texas, and then, after he had become wealthy, in New York. Because of Charles Stillman's breakdown, his only son James early accepted the responsibility of managing the family fortune. The author sketchily traces the events which led James into banking, and then into the City Bank, which he built up so tremendously. It was everything to him, more than family—bigger than anything else in his life. His family life is shown in all its coldness, to which he brought his business manner with its lack of affection, its silence, its often scathing condemnation of errors, and with, too, its lack of praise. The author briefly brings in the scandals that enveloped the lives of some of James Stillman's children, the rise of Frank A. Vanderlip in the National City Bank, the working methods of Wall Street groups, Stillman's long illness—all in a short, snappy manner. The book (not a long one) is exciting and fascinating to read. The student will undoubtedly find Mr. Winkler's book an interesting introduction to American "high finance" and its methods.

F. A.



## BOOKS AND AUTHORS

**Classroom Helps.**—"Exploring Latin" (American Book Company), by a committee of Latin teachers, is a unique textbook for junior high school classes. Designed as a try-out language course, the book combines, in its brief compass of 137 pages and a valuable appendix, the advantages of the more formal word analysis of an earlier generation and the much needed prognosis test of the present. In addition, it cannot fail to arouse enthusiasm for language study in those so minded; and for the less fortunate it provides a working knowledge of their mother tongue. The outgrowth of eight years of class-room experience, the book is eminently practical.

"Webster's Shorter School Dictionary" (American Book Company) is condensed from the Elementary School Dictionary and contains a very complete vocabulary of over 35,000 words and phrases. It is illustrated, well bound, and decidedly up-to-date.

"An Introduction to Liturgical Latin" (Humphries, Boston. \$2.00), by A. M. Scarre, is destined for those who learn Latin to read not the classics, but the missal and breviary. While amply meeting the needs of ordinary ecclesiastical Latin, the syntax is vastly simpler, and the vocabulary incomparably easier. From the outset the illustrative materials are drawn from the Gospels, the Psalms, the Mass. The author expresses the hope, a bit sanguine perhaps, that a year's study in this course will unlock the full contents of the liturgical texts. This seems an ideal book for novitiates and motherhouses.

Scott, Foresman and Company offers a practice book to aid reading and composition in "Better Work Habits" (60 cents), by Salisbury; and a most entertaining and practical "Arithmetic Work-Book" by Knight, Ruch, and Studebaker for the grades, accompanied by a very suggestive teacher's edition, "Exercises in Everyday Writing" by Grose.

**Studies in Art.**—Lovers of Nature in her changing moods, especially as displayed in forest and glen and by the banks of enchanting streams, will thrill over the exquisite aquatone reproductions of Herman Miller's "Moods of the Wissahickon" (University of Pennsylvania Press. \$2.00). The artist has spent half a century pursuing the beauties of this wonderland of Philadelphia. With a true poet's gift of selection and an uncanny craftsmanship he has managed to capture and hold in a page of multitudinous tiny dots not only whole scenes but the feeling and mood which they spontaneously evoke. These six drawings in the present collection picture these woodlands in the phases of the seasons; and the delicate tracery of tree, flower, and stone by the winding river deserve to be called, as they are by the artist, "lead-pencil mosaics." The pictures are printed separately on good paper fit for framing.

The essays in "Beauty Looks after Herself" (Sheed and Ward. \$2.00), are varying exposures of that hackneyed word *beauty*. Mr. Gill is an artist; his pages are touched with becoming modesty and dressed in his own neat Perpetua type. His recurrent definition of beauty is that it is the child of goodness and truth, nourished by religion. Exploring beauty he encounters the term *fine art*, defining it as skill plus delight. The book is readily quotable, abounding in brevities like "good taste is mortified taste." The style, close clipped and direct, appeals to cultured readers who enjoy essays.

**Recent Poetry.**—"Icaro" (Oxford University Press. \$3.00) is a poetic drama in the manner of a Greek tragedy, and deals with the flight of Icarus and his death. It was written by Lauro de Bosis, youthful aviator and poet, who lost his life in October, 1931, after his flight over Rome. The lengthy play has been exquisitely translated from the Italian by Ruth Draper, long distinguished for her monologues. And Gilbert Murray contributes the preface in which he points out the author's "double expression of his ideals, first in poetry, and then in life and death."

John Richard Moreland, well-known Southern lyric poet, brings us a variety of good things in his latest book, "The Moon Mender" (Kaleidograph Press, Dallas, Tex. \$1.50). There is a singing quality about Mr. Moreland's muse that makes his poems stay long in one's memory. Then, too, his outlook on life is sane and healthy. The poet believes that in spite of the present age being out of joint, "God's in his heaven and all's right with the world." The little volume should win Mr. Moreland a host of readers.

"Poems 1930-1933" (Caxton. \$2.00), by Benjamin Musser, is a gathering together of all the verses the author has thought worthy of preservation since 1930 up to the present. The rather large volume is divided into eleven sections, giving the reader a great deal of variety on many subjects. There are such good things as "The Formal Garden," that prove the poet is capable of reaching the heights. But it seems a pity that Mr. Musser did not use more discrimination in the compilation of the book, for some of the poems are not up to the high standards manifested in the best of his work. The book, however, is quite worth while since it is enhanced by the many fine pieces it has to offer.

In order to commemorate the seventh centennial of the founding of the Order of the Servants of Mary (the Servite Fathers), the seminarians of that organization have published an anthology of poetry called "Seven Hundred Years" (The Servite Fathers, Mount St. Philip Monastery, Granville, Wis. \$1.00). Many devotional and inspirational thoughts are preserved in this little souvenir that will be a source of comfort and delight to the many friends and well-wishers of these devoted tillers of the Lord's vineyard.

**Science Texts.**—"Experimental Optics" (Appleton. \$2.00), by A. Frederick Collins, is a "how-to-do-it" book that goes beyond mere manipulation, and tells essential facts about the physics of light. Color, diffraction, bending of rays, spectroscopy—these and other subjects are treated simply and well, in a style suited to either juveniles or adults.

"Everyday Problems in Science" (Scott, Foresman. \$1.60), by Charles J. Pieper and Wilbur L. Beauchamp, is a 700-page survey of pure and applied science, already a favored text in high schools. Its scope, thoroughness, and reliability make it also a convenient reference volume in private or public libraries.

**Books Received.**—This list is published, without recommendation, for the benefit of our readers. Some of the books will be reviewed in later issues.

AFTER REVELATION, WHAT? Irving Fisher. \$1.50. Adelphi.  
BLACK MOUNTAIN, THE. Alan Hillgarth. \$2.50. Knopf.  
CAN WE LIMIT WAR? Hoffman Nickerson. \$2.75. Stokes.  
CATHOLIC REVIVAL AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD, THE. 75 cents. Morehouse.  
DAWN TO DUSK. Josephine Wilson. 6/. Gill.  
HARUN AL RASHID. H. St. John Philby. \$1.50. Appleton-Century.  
LETTERS OF STEPHEN GARDINER, THE. Edited by J. A. Muller. \$10.50. Macmillan.  
LOVE OF THE CRUCIFIED, THE. Rev. Karl Clemens, C.S.S.R. \$4.75. Pastet.  
MODERN ENCYCLOPEDIA, THE. Edited by A. H. McDannald. \$3.50. Wise.  
MODERN ENCYCLOPEDIA FOR CHILDREN, THE. \$2.50. Collins.  
MORAL LAW, THE. Most Rev. John J. Swint. 50 cents. Bruce.  
MY RUSSIAN NEIGHBORS. Alexander Wickstead. \$1.75. McGraw-Hill.  
OUR COMMON ENEMY: COLDS. \$1.00. McBride.  
QUEEN ELIZABETH. J. E. Neale. \$3.75. Harcourt, Brace.  
RELATION OF SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS TO READING ABILITY, THE. M. R. Ladd. \$1.50. Teachers College, Columbia University.  
REVOLUTION. Adolph Gillis. \$2.00. Duffield and Green.  
SCARLET WOMAN. Octavus Roy Cohen. \$2.00. Appleton-Century.  
SEA LEVEL. Anne Parrish. \$2.50. Harper.  
SHADOW PASSES, A. Eden Phillpotts. \$2.00. Macmillan.  
STEPHEN FOSTER. John T. Howard. \$3.50. Crowell.  
STORY OF MY DEATH, THE. Lauro de Bosis. \$1.00. Oxford University Press.  
SUMMER'S PLAY. G. B. Sterns. \$2.50. Knopf.  
TIA BARBARITA. Barbara Peart. \$2.50. Houghton Mifflin.  
TU ES PETRUS. 60 francs. Bloud et Gay.  
UNFORGOTTEN PRISONER, THE. R. C. Hutchinson. \$2.75. Farrar and Rinehart.  
UNITED STATES AND THE SOVIET UNION, THE. \$1.00. American Foundation.  
VALOUR. Warwick Deeping. \$2.00. McBride.  
WATCHER'S PLAY, THE. Rudolph Henz. 30 cents. Catholic Dramatic Movement.  
WELL OF DAYS, THE. Ivan Bunin. \$2.50. Knopf.  
WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR. Hilaire Belloc. \$1.50. Appleton-Century.  
WOMEN AND REPEAL. Grace C. Root. \$1.50. Harper.  
YOUR SACRED BODY. Catherine Cotton. \$2.00. Macmillan.

**Falling Star. The Menace. The Cat's-Paw. Mr. Death.**

Voicing the formal verdict of the hierarchy, the Bishop of Los Angeles, with first-hand information on the subject, has published a vigorous condemnation of Hollywood's manners and methods and its demoralizing motion picture output. Almost coincident with this comes to the public Vicki Baum's latest novel, "Falling Star" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00), having for its theme the conditions and practices the Bishops regard as calling for condemnation and reform. The story is coarse, vulgar, dull, in construction and treatment, and unattractive for any decent-minded reader. It would be fortunate, if such disclosures would arouse public sentiment to a point where the producers and the performers would fear public censure and clean up a depraving and disgraceful situation. But one regrets to see this creator of "best-sellers" go the way of all flesh in her selection of characters and in the development of her story.

When an author produces two thrillers within half a year, we cannot expect much either in the line of plot, character, or style. However, we are agreeably disappointed by Sydney Horler. While there is a marked similarity between "The Harlequin of Death" and his latest "The Menace" (Little, Brown. \$2.00), there are many points of divergence. Again we have the wealthy American and his heiress daughter. She, of course, falls in love with a prominent and promising Britisher; but in the case of "The Menace" it is not love at first sight, for Mr. Horler strings a new shaft to Cupid's bow, Mary Brandell is enamored at the mere picture of Philip Cranston. Again the probabilities are made of gutta-percha but the enthralled reader does not realize it till he has closed the book with a sigh of satisfaction, for "All's well that ends well." Mystery fans will find excitement in "The Menace." You may guess the villain but you won't guess the cause of the villainy. This must be added about the writings of Sydney Horler: they are as clean as a whistle, and they are short, two virtues that are not always found in the mystery-detective stories of the day. If you like mystery tales, you will like this one very much.

In view of recent events, what the publishers call "an uproariously funny story of city politics," has a timely advent. It is "The Cat's-Paw" (Harper. \$2.00) by Clarence Budington Kelland. Strange things are always evolving in politics so you can be entertained and amused by the fanciful story of the son of an American missionary in China returning to the land of his ancestors and settling down in a ring-racket-ridden city. Here by a fluke he is picked up as the candidate for mayor by a group of sham-reform politicians. To their consternation, when he is elected, he insists on standing by his prelection promises of honesty and reform. He has, of course, a very hard time getting the best of the racketeers, but virtue triumphs with the fantastic aid of a wealthy Chinese merchant who feels under special obligations to the missionary father. A pleasant little romance is woven into the details of the political revolution, and the whole makes a clean, amusing story with a kaleidoscopic whirl improbable at times to the exactly critical but likely to hold the attention and approval of all who are weary of the "problem" and "realistic" variety of current volumes. Of course, it will not do to take the author's methods of reform too seriously.

He terrorized London, did "Mr. Death" (Doubleday, Doran. \$2.00), until Superintendent Bendilow of Scotland Yard set himself to match wits with that arch-criminal. Mr. Death made a practice of writing short notes to prominent industrialists, directing them to have for him £10,000, or similar sums. If they neglected to obey his instructions, they were invariably found dead—for Mr. Death seemed always able to "get his man." Carlton Wallace has told a fast-moving, fascinating detective story in this; it swings the reader along with it. Even though, on reflection, it may develop defects in logicalness, these are not serious. Mr. Wallace departs from the old familiar manner in this, and it is a welcome change. But is Scotland Yard a home of super-geniuses?

## Communications

*Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.*

**Reply to Father Blakely**

*To the Editor of AMERICA:*

In the issue of AMERICA for January 27 Father Blakely takes exception to some statements I made in an article in the *Homiletic Monthly*. The subject is greater than either debater, and so I obtrude the personal angle only to express my dislike for a kind of trope that Father Blakely several times employs. He juxtaposes this writer with the Holy Father and then (pardon the term) plays the latter as a kind of trump. The rhetoric is unnecessary and besides in argumentation of this nature he should not use even the name of a bishop in the same breath as our Holy Father and much less any one else. Whenever I see this trope, it strikes me as being in bad taste. Let us poor humans mill about in the arena, but let us also keep the Holy Father on the high pedestal the Christian world has given him.

My first nine pages were the basis of the whole article; in these pages I did not at all refer to present-day youth for which the Encyclical was written. I made it very clear that our present-day product does not at all measure up to expectations with the inevitable inference that this product needs more and more, higher and higher schools. Instead I employed many paragraphs to describe a method of teaching religion which could ultimately produce better Catholics, that is, relatively ideal pupils. The Encyclical is not concerned with brick and mortar but with a sacred idea and an apostolic achievement. I tried to describe a short cut by which these very intentions might be realized more quickly. Next I described economic conditions so changed that no one could have foreseen them and concluded that a change of arrangement had been forced upon me. Having established these two bases, I was not yet satisfied but went on to show how looming dangers might be minimized and perhaps entirely overcome; this last effort might strike any one as fanciful, but necessity has made a fact out of many a fancy. In my every step I tried to get away as far as possible from the situation described by the Encyclical.

Theology tells us that our pupils must avoid an approximate occasion which might cause injury to their Faith. The same source also provides for exceptions: firstly, we may go into a danger if we cannot reasonably avoid it, providing we use other precautions to lessen the danger; secondly, we may, taking the same precautions, go into a danger for the sake of a greater good. Most Catholic dioceses in the world, convinced that condition No. 1 was present, have felt themselves justified in following a school system more or less truncated. The Encyclical tolerates such an exception "on the approval of the Ordinary alone, under determined circumstances of place and time, and with special precautions." As to condition No. 2, which I undeniably linked to No. 1, Father Blakely claims I am entirely wrong. I draw a picture of precautions taken and dangers minimized; at the end of his first column Father Blakely generously removes the rest of the difficulties, but still says "No." Argument is fanciful because these conditions could not be fulfilled for many a year. If that day ever comes, the Ordinary makes the decision, "Yes" or "No."

Altogether my article comprised about twenty-four paragraphs, about two of which contained the main statement which Father Blakely anathematizes. If there is the faintest suspicion that these two, based on several hypotheses, do not "think with the Church," then by all means lop them off, throw them into the waste basket. I have knelt at the Holy Father's feet and have felt the kind hand of his favors. Were I as convinced of my position as that



two and two make four, and the Holy Father has spoken otherwise, I would pluck out that idea as the Scripture tells us to pluck out the right eye that scandalizes.

The answer in AMERICA would, though, have read better, had it acknowledged some truth somewhere in the long article. It might have been courteous to comment favorably upon the first nine pages which described a method of teaching religion through which we could still better carry out the ideas of the Encyclical.

The major portion of my article dealt with parochial schools as the Encyclical does. If we give more attention to the method of teaching religion in these schools and do not diminish interest in them while we expend effort on the higher schools, this writer believes that we can eventually produce boy and girl graduates who, while still in their teens, will already be men and women for Catholic Action.

With no intent at flippancy, I would, though, request Father Blakely to aid me in answering the following questions:

Granted that the natural and Divine laws are immutable, is disciplinary legislation based on conditions prevalent at the time of composition? If conditions could be improved or changes be forced upon us which could not have been foreseen, would the legislation be likely to be changed?

If it is financially impossible to build enough Catholic high schools to house all our graduates, is it sound business to do the next best thing, namely, advocate junior high schools?

If a city has reached the limit of constructing high schools and still the majority of graduates cannot be accommodated, is it apostolic to turn them into junior highs in order to give twice the number part instead of all the number all of the Catholic education?

Catholic Action can be realized only through contact with Protestantism. If we made our boy a man in faith earlier, might we let him contact earlier? I did indeed express a disregard of dangers in this matter because I cannot get over the convictions that we have the Church and the sacraments which, if properly used, should make us fear nothing.

Have you any plan to save the millions of non-Catholic children in our public schools? Is it apostolic just to think of ourselves and give absolutely no thought to their salvation?

In conclusion, Father, let you and me work and strive that, *salva obedientia* we can some day take in all of our own and perhaps also the millions at our door in order to extend to them the sacred benefits of the great Encyclical "Christian Education of Youth."

Aurora, Ill.

M. A. SCHUMACHER.

[In answer Father Blakely states: "I shall be quite content if the interested reader will kindly compare Monsignor Schumacher's letter with my article, and then draw his own conclusions." The article is in the issue of AMERICA for January 27.—Ed. AMERICA.]

#### Chant Crusaders

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The recent letter of the Rev. Edgar Boyle is so thought provoking, so thoroughly enjoyed here in clerical circles, that we appeal to him to write another. In country parishes what he advocates can be done. If so, why not in larger centers?

Twenty years ago in St. Bernard Parish, Detroit, the children were taught the Requiem and Missa de Angelis, and every Sunday and holy day since there has been congregational singing at the children's Mass, also on week days where Requiem or High Masses were scheduled in that parish.

The present writer had a parish with a mission; Gregorian Masses were taught and sung in both churches.

Here there are about 200 families, a small village, yet there is a vested choir of men and boys, twenty-two in number placed in a chancel. They sing only Gregorian music at all services, including Candlemas day, Holy Week, Forty Hour processions, Masses for the Liturgical Seasons, Vespers, the Te Deum, proper of the Mass. The congregation is taught the Credo and responses.

The writer was a very ordinary singer in the seminary, yet it was easy and a pleasure to accomplish this. What might not the many priests with fine musical talent accomplish? Let us hear from more Edgar Boyles with the spirit of just indignation.

Portland, Mich.

(REV.) W. J. O'ROURKE.

#### "Poor Lady More!"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I call the attention of your readers to an error in the issue of AMERICA for January 27? It occurs in the very fine article of Theodore Maynard on "Poor Lady More!"

That Mistress Alice was illiterate in the sense of not possessing any high degree of culture is quite certain. But when the writer says that "it is more likely than not that she could not herself even read English," I think he does less than justice to the woman who was so fortunate as to be the wife of a Saint. At any rate, the premise on which he founds his conclusion is false. "No letter to her," says he, "is in existence." Now it is definitely known that More did write to his wife from the Tower of London. On being deprived of all books and writing materials, "he continued to write to his wife and favorite daughter, Margaret, on stray scraps of paper with a charred stick or piece of coal" [Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. xiv, p. 692].

Moreover, there is (or was) in existence at least one letter to Lady More, for it is quoted in its entirety in that splendid new life of Thomas More by Daniel Sargent. It was written by More at Woodstock on September 3, 1528, on being informed through his son-in-law Heron of the burning down of his barns through the carelessness of a neighbor [p. 95f]. Permit me to quote only one short passage from it:

He (God) sent us all that we have lost; and sith he hath by such a chance taken it away again, his pleasure be fulfilled. Let us never grudge thereat, but take it in good worth, and heartily thank him as well for adversity as for prosperity. And peradventure we have more cause to thank him for our loss than for our winning. For his wisdom better seeth what is good for us than we do ourselves. Truly, the letter of a saint, showing a spirit of detachment from worldly possessions that is all too rare among men.

This letter, I think, and the fact that he is known to have written others to his wife, are sufficient to prove that Lady More was not illiterate in the specific sense of not being able to read.

Pittsburgh.

(REV.) PETER J. BERNARDING.

#### Wise Liquor Legislation

To the Editor of AMERICA:

We have a sympathetic understanding for the opinions of those persons who have felt the ravages of intemperance, and who have come, therefore, to have a blind hatred for liquor. But it would be wrong to accept their point of view in liquor legislation.

The Rockefeller Committee has rendered a public service by making its survey and research in the interests of a reasonable solution. AMERICA comes to the problem by way of another method, arguing from known moral precepts. To reach a rational agreement through both methods will give us a liquor-control system which is at once morally sound and practicable.

The overwhelming sentiment of the people in many towns and some cities of the middle West and South is unalterably opposed to public drinking houses. In these localities legislation expressing the public will can be enforced effectively. On the other hand, the people in our large cities approve the sale of liquor for consumption on the premises, and laws to prevent its being done where contrary to the popular will are always harmful.

Wise legislators ought to express in their laws both what is right and what is wanted, where the two are compatible. Where saloons are legalized it should be through laws which, to quote the Chief Justice, "will find a ground for rational compromise between individual rights and public welfare."

To expect the law to do less is to say popular government has failed.

Omaha.

JOHN R. ROSS.

## Chronicle

**Home News.**—The Treasury Department began operations on February 1 to maintain the dollar at 59.06 cents in relation to foreign currencies, hoping that other Governments would cooperate and avoid a currency war. On February 3 it was reported that millions in gold bullion had left England for America because of the monetary program of the United States. The Treasury's gold profit on devaluation of the dollar was put at \$2,805,512,060. On February 2, the Senate passed the Johnson bill, which would bar future security flotations in the United States by nations in default to this Government on debts. The bill was sent to the House, which was said to be in favor of it. Also on February 2, the President was reported as reconsidering his decision to stop the Civil Works program by May 1. On February 5, the House passed the \$950,000,000 appropriation bill by a vote of 283 to 1. It would allow continuation of the Civil Works Administration and direct Federal relief to States. In an address on February 2 to the forty-eight State directors of the National Emergency Council, the President urged them to be "hard-boiled" in keeping politics out of the relief program. On the same day he made public plans for the formation of a bank, with funds to be supplied by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, for the financing in part of exports, particularly those destined for the Soviet Union. On February 5, the Supreme Court sustained a decision that repeal deprived the court of jurisdiction on further proceedings under prohibition-violation indictments, thus in effect striking from the dockets of Federal courts throughout the country pre-repeal prohibition cases, originating prior to December 5, 1933, estimated at from 9,000 to 13,000 in number. The decision affects not only cases where indictments have been returned, but where convictions have been obtained and have been appealed. Because of his refusal to permit a Senate investigating committee to see records of his negotiations with air-mail companies, and an admission by him that some of his papers had been removed and destroyed, William P. MacCracken, Jr., was arrested on February 2 by order of the Senate. He was Assistant Secretary of Commerce in charge of Aeronautics under President Hoover, and later Washington representative of many air lines.

**Revolt in Paris.**—February 6 last is already a famous date in French history. Tumult and disorder marked the session of the Chamber of Deputies on that day when Premier Daladier, coming before the House for the first time since the formation of his Cabinet, asked for confirmation of his Government. Amidst a clamor probably unparalleled in modern parliaments, he won two votes of confidence; but when he refused to accept interpellation on the Stavisky affair, the session broke up in wild disorder. Meanwhile, outside the Chamber a mob comprising Royalists, veterans, civil-service workers, Fascists, Socialists, and Communists, all brought together by a com-

mon fury against the Parliament, assembled in the Place de la Concorde and in various streets near the Chamber. They were soon in conflict with the police and the military who had been brought to the city in expectation of trouble. Bloody hand-to-hand fighting took place, but when the mob finally charged the bridge leading to the Chamber, the police resorted to gunfire. Ten persons were killed and more than 500 wounded in the night's rioting. The clashes continued all during the following day and night. It was reported at one time that the number of demonstrators amounted to 30,000 persons, and the Wednesday night fighting was just as bloody, though not as concentrated, as on the preceding evening. Meanwhile, the War veterans served notice that on Thursday night they would carry arms and would be joined by thousands of armed citizens. Moreover, the municipal officials acting as a civic body went to the Premier and demanded his resignation. It became clear that the Federal Government was virtually engaged in a civil war with the city of Paris.

**Doumergue Succeeds Daladier.**—In this crisis and to prevent further bloodshed, the Daladier Government resigned, and President Lebrun immediately telephoned to Gaston Doumergue at his home in the south of France asking him to come to the rescue of the nation. Indeed ex-President Doumergue, though seventy years old, seemed to be the only man capable of restoring order. Principally because he was a non-party man, but also because he was a conservative, with a reputation for honesty and a deep respect for Constitutional forms, he alone could be expected to form a concentration Government that would win the respect of the people. As M. Doumergue entrained for Paris, the leaders of both Houses and all the former Premiers were called into a meeting and asked to call a truce on party quarreling and to support the new Cabinet which M. Doumergue might choose. It was expected that if the ex-President finally agreed to accept the Premiership (at present date of writing he had not given final assent), he would ask for the immediate dissolution of the Chamber, choose his Cabinet from all parties, and ask for power to rule by decree during the emergency, thus constituting himself as a virtual dictator. Meanwhile, as a protest against the threat of Fascism, the National Confederation of Labor issued orders for a general strike to last twenty-four hours.

**New Governor in Puerto Rico.**—Major-Gen. Blanton Winship, retired, became Governor of Puerto Rico on February 5, succeeding Robert H. Gore, with an impressive ceremony in San Juan. The new Governor was roundly applauded when he declared his intention of extending the benefits of the NRA and AAA to Puerto Rico. The crowd applauded still more his announcement that President Roosevelt planned to visit the Island soon after the end of the present session of Congress.

**Austrian Heimwehr Threatens.**—Chancellor Dollfuss was patiently fighting to maintain his dictatorship in a middle course, but there were reasons to fear that he



would be unable to resist the growing force of the Fascist Heimwehr led by Prince von Starhemberg. In spite of the demonstrations in honor of the Chancellor, when over 100,000 of the Peasants' party paraded in Vienna on February 2, and the fact that his Cabinet after a long and fiery debate unanimously authorized his carrying of Austria's complaint against Germany to the League of Nations, it was plain that many sections of his supporters were becoming convinced that only Fascism, copying the Italian model, will be able to save Austria from the Nazis and their program of Anschluss. The Heimwehr at Innsbruck, and then in Linz, and later in other Provinces, massed their forces, while demanding the right to advise the local Government officials. It was rumored that the Heimwehr, if their demands were not acceded to, might suddenly take over the Government, declaring a Fascist State, negotiate with the Austrian Nazis for an independent Austria, and destroy the Socialist party, while ending all factional politics. Baron Emmerich von Pfluegl, Austrian delegate to the League of Nations, notified the League that it would formally register its case in the immediate future after England, France, and Italy had had sufficient time to study the documents submitted to them. Chancellor Dollfuss spent two days in conference with Premier Goemboes of Hungary, leaving Vice-Chancellor Emil Frey, the head of the Heimwehr, in complete charge.

**The League's Embarrassment.**—General distaste and embarrassment seemed to be the fruit of the Austrian plan, as announced, to appeal to the League of Nations for defense against the Nazis. The British, in particular, were not inclined to take risks to save the present Government or to antagonize the Hitler regime. Article XI of the League covenant, which would presumably be invoked by Austria, reads as follows:

1. Any war or threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the Members of the League or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole League, and the League shall take any action that may be deemed wise and effectual to safeguard the peace of nations. In case any such emergency should arise the Secretary-General shall on the request of any Member of the League forthwith summon a meeting of the Council.

2. It is also declared to be the friendly right of each Member of the League to bring to the attention of the Assembly or of the Council any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb international peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends.

Without waiting until the Council could assemble, the Secretary of the League could inform the respective parties that the dispute was now before the court.

**Germany's Recklessness.**—The German Government showed a complete contempt for Austria's complaint of interference. The answer sent to Vienna denied guilt and indicated indifference. The German press ridiculed the idea of a solution through the League of Nations, and it was generally known that the three great Powers backing Austria were loath to force a crisis with Germany at this time. Hitler seemed satisfied to wait on

the success of the Austrian Nazis and the disaffection of the Fascist Heimwehr. Both of these military elements were moving in the direction of a type of government with which Hitler might come to terms. Near chaos reigned in the Protestant situation. On February 7, Reich Bishop Mueller took another step in his dictatorial policy and by a new edict made his own word law, abolishing the whole presidial Board, lay and ecclesiastical, of the Prussian Church Union. By this decree the Bishop may transfer, demote, or retire any pastor in Prussia who attempts to oppose him. The surrender of many Lutheran Bishops to Dr. Mueller's political control weakened the Pastors' Emergency League. The 6,000 revolting clergymen were said to be determined to carry on, but there was little hope of their success.

**Call to World Revolution.**—A resounding summons to world revolution was given on February 3 to the delegates to the All-Union Communist party congress in session in Moscow by D. Z. Manuilsky, a member of the executive committee of the Communist International. M. Manuilsky called the Communist parties in China and Germany the "chief military detachments of the Communist International" and mentioned France, Poland, and Czechoslovakia as among the countries where Communist forces had grown considerably in the last few years. The published text of the report did not mention the United States. A vigorous speech from Klementi Voroshilov, Commissar for War and Marine, denounced the Japanese preparations for war by sea and land, particularly by reorganizing armed forces and preparing for attack in Manchuria. The seriousness of war in the Far East was dwelt upon. Talk of war with Russia, as well as with the United States, was scouted as absurd by Prince Iyesato Tokugawa, former President of the Japanese House of Peers, who arrived in Toronto on February 5. Said Prince Tokugawa: "The interests of Japan and our Soviet neighbors are for peace." Exemption in the meanwhile from regulations for deliveries of grain and other agricultural produce were decreed on February 5 for peasants in Western Siberia and pay increases for workers and employes in that area were also established.

**Ambassador Bullitt To Return.**—Announcement was made in Washington that William C. Bullitt, American Ambassador to Moscow, would leave for Russia on February 15. A White House conference on credits, participated in on February 1 by Ambassador Bullitt, Jesse H. Jones, Chairman of the RFC, and John Wiley, counselor of the Embassy at Moscow, resulted in no definite plan. Said Mr. Jones: "We discussed the possibility of working out some exchange business with different countries. Some swapping or trading arrangement." More than 1,000 citizens and corporations were disclosed on February 6 as having filed claims with the State Department in Washington against Soviet Russia. No official estimate of the total of individual claims had been made. There were estimates of \$65,000,000 for

properties of corporations alleged to have been confiscated by the Soviet Union's nationalization of all properties in Russia; \$86,000,000 up to \$100,000,000 of Tsarist Government securities; \$337,223,288 for loans made by the United States to the Kerensky Provisional Government in 1917. Mr. Bullitt will be accompanied by a group of selected experts.

**Disarmament Debate.**—February 7 saw the close of a lengthy debate on disarmament in the British House of Commons. No vote was taken, and ideas seemed to be about evenly divided; but there appeared to be general agreement as to the threat of war. No reply had been received to the British disarmament proposals sent to the various nations. Sir John Simon, British Foreign Minister, maintained, when questioned, that Great Britain favored a demilitarized zone; and that he stood not for equal armament for Germany but for equal rights to armament. Sir John likewise maintained that the French demand for security was assured by the agreement to consult in the event of a threat of war. French opinion, however, was reported as considering this an insufficient guarantee; while the traditional British horror of commitments caused sharp interrogations to be aimed at Sir John as to whether his consultative plan would thus bind the nation. Opposition was voiced by leaders of the Labor party to the Simon disarmament plan. Stanley Baldwin, Lord President of the Council, insisted that the League of Nations must be maintained, while Britain, he contended, should rearm within the limits of existing agreements.

**Labor Troubles in Cuba.**—The properties of the Cuban Electric Company, which supplies practically all the gas, light, and power of the Island, were returned to their American owners on February 3 by President Mendieta. The commission appointed by the President to investigate the relations of the company with its employees presented a report severely criticizing the company's policy toward its help and asserting that the demands of the workers were reasonable and would cost the company only about \$10,000 extra each month. The commission also condemned the company's action in discharging old employees in favor of youthful workers who were hired at lower wages, and the large number of foreign experts who were employed. As soon as the employees heard that the owners had recovered their property, about half of them walked out and for twenty-four hours public utility service was at a standstill. After several days of serious disorder President Mendieta signed a decree on February 6 outlawing strikes affecting light, water, telephone, telegraph, medical, fire-fighting, and transportation services. The decree provided machinery for settling all labor troubles. A maximum penalty of two year's imprisonment was provided for violations. Dr. Juan Antiga, a physician, was appointed Secretary of Labor, completing the Mendieta Cabinet. A quota of 600,000 gallons for Cuban rum was set by United States Secretary Hull. It was expected that some equivalent concession by the

Cuban Government would be made before the rum would be permitted to enter the United States.

**Census Returns in Czechoslovakia.**—Increase in the population of Czechoslovakia from 13,913,172 in 1921 to 14,479,565 in 1930 was shown in the census returns for 1930. The Slavic population (Czechs and Slovaks) grew during that time both absolutely and in percentage (from 16.51 per cent to 66.91 per cent). There was a decrease, in percentage, of Germans, Magyars, and Jews. Due to the apostasy which took place in 1918, there was a decrease in the percentage, though not of number, of Catholics of the Latin rite but a slight increase both in percentage and number of Eastern Rite Catholics. Complaints made by Hungarian revisionists against the fairness of the Czech enumerators in taking the census in the Hungarian minority sections of Slovakia were vigorously denied by the editor of the *Central European Observer*.

**Attempted Mexican School Seizure.**—Treasury Department officials on February 5 vainly endeavored to seize for the Government, under a law enacted last December, a Catholic girls' school in the suburb of Micoac. The 400 boarding pupils of the school, ranging in age from five to nineteen years, barricaded themselves and refused to leave the building. Their defiance was reported to be due to a desire to protect the Sisters who conduct the school from possible arrest, and also because the families of most of the pupils live in other parts of Mexico. A crowd of 2,000 gathered from the neighborhood, and finally the Treasury agents were forced to postpone taking over the buildings and other properties, for the present at least.

**Paraguay Takes Key Fort in Chaco.**—After a month's fighting which began on January 7, the day after the armistice terminated, Paraguayan troops captured Fort Lachina and seized a large quantity of war materials. The Paraguayans were preparing to push on twenty-three miles further to Fort Cabezon, the capture of which would complete their campaign to drive the Bolivians out of the Gran Chaco.

The recent beatification of Roch Gonzalez and his companions of South America will be the subject of John LaFarge's article, "A Martyred Friend of the Indians."

The second of Basil Walker's series of articles on social justice as good business will deal with "The Attack on the Problem."

As a sequel to Herbert Kramer's recent article on art in Europe, the same writer will contribute "Americans and Catholic Art."

"Bankers as Directors" will be the title of an article concerning recent revelations, and it will be written by Floyd Anderson.

Donald Hayne will show how pamphlets can be used to great advantage in religion classes.